

AN
1337
EXAMINATION

Of a late

VINDICATION

OF

A Defence of Baptism with Water
and Infant-Baptism asserted. *K*

WHEREIN

The VALIDITY of a former REPLY to that
DEFENCE, and the INSUFFICIENCY of its
Vindication, are demonstrated. *by J. S. 1739*

With A POSTSCRIPT

Relating to the PROTESTANT REFORMATION,
ACADEMICAL LEARNING, and a DECLARATION
of GEORGE FOX against Popery.

L O N D O N :

Printed and Sold by the Assigns of J. Sowle, at the
Bible in George Yard, Lombard-street. 1739.

EXAMINATION

OF A

WITNESS

A Defence of the

and the



PLATE

THE

WITNESS

THE

THE

THE

THE

THE

A N

EXAMINATION

O F

A late VINDICATION, &c.

The INTRODUCTION.

THE Author of the *Vindication* begins with informing his Reader, that ‘ this Dispute
 ‘ about Baptism has been spun into a greater
 ‘ Bulk, and carried thro’ a greater Length
 ‘ of Time than was at first expected.’ But whose Fault’s that ? His own ; who having undertaken a Task too hard for him, viz. * *To prove from Scripture, that sprinkling Infants on their Foreheads with a little Water is the Baptism of Christ, instituted by him, and practised by his Apostles,* has multiplied Words to amuse his Readers, and to conceal his own Lack of Argument.

That Christ did institute Water-baptism, he has labour’d, we think, hitherto unsuccessfully, to prove : Though, were his Arguments for Water-baptism as cogent, as to us they seem weak, we see no real Service they could do to him or his Church, who are found only in the Practice of *Rantism* (or Sprinkling.)

* See the Letter to the Clergy of *Northumberland*, p. 6.

So that his *unchristian* Imputation of their being *no Christians* who disuse Water baptism, by him levell'd at the *Quakers*, affects also the Members of his own Church, in whom the Omission of that Ceremony seems less excusable; for, the *Quakers* Disuse of Water-baptism is grounded on a firm Perswasion of Mind, that it is long since ceased in Point of Obligation; whereas himself and his Brethren, while they plead in Words for the necessary Continuance of that Ceremony, have generally laid it aside, and practise another in its Stead.

The Weakness of his *Defence*, both of *Water-baptism* in general, and of *Infant-sprinkling* in particular, we think we have fully shewn in our *Reply*; but seeing he appears by this *Vindication* to be one of those who are more easily confuted, than put to Silence, we judge it our Duty to be no less liberal of our Labour in *maintaining Truth*, than he or his Abettors in *vindicating Error*; for, as Bishop *Juell*, in his *Apology of the Church of England*, well expresses it, 'If it be lawful for these Folkes to be eloquent and fine-tongued in speaking Evil, surely it becommeth not us, in our Cause, being so very good, to be dumbe in answering truely.'

S E C T. I.

Concerning the Signification of the Word Baptize.

THE *Vindicator*, instead of proving his *Practice of Sprinkling* to be agreeable to Scripture, has endeavoured by Misconstruction to force the Text to speak what he practises; and would fain have the Word *Baptize* to signify *Sprinkle*.

In order to which he was pleas'd to say, that 'the Word *βάπτω* in *Dan. iv. 33.* signifies *barely to wet*.' In my *Reply* I shewed him that such a diminutive Signification was not agreeable to the Subject there treated of, which

which was, ‘*Nebuchadnezzar’s* being exposed to all the ‘*Extremities of Weather*, to all the Showers and Storms ‘that fell, for a long season of Time.’ In answer to this, he now says, ‘*Babylon* is the most mild and serene ‘*Region* perhaps in the ‘*World*.’ But has he never read or heard from Travellers, that this mild and serene Region is not always without Showers and Storms, and that the Nocturnal Dews there are little inferior to Rain? But, I hope, in this Point he is satisfied, since he seems to grant, *Vind.* p. 2. that ‘*Nebuchadnezzar’s* Body was ‘soaked with a continued Dew.’ And that ‘this Judgment lasted seven Years,’ which, as I told him before, *Reply* p. 3. is so far from being less than one Dipping, that ‘tis equivalent to many; and well agrees with the several Versions of the Text by me instanced. If he will make no Distinction betwixt *bare wetting* and a continued Soaking for seven Years, can I help it? ‘Tis sufficient for me, that Men of better Understanding will.

From *βάπτω* he passes on to *βαπτίζω*, which, he says, he ‘will shew contains under it not only *Washing*, but ‘*Affusion* and *Sprinkling* ;’ and cites *Leigh* in his *Critica sacra* saying, that ‘the Word *βαπτίζω* baptize, tho’ ‘it be derived from *βάπτω* to dip or plunge into the Water, and signifies peculiarly such a kind of Washing as ‘is used in *Bucks* where Linen is plunged or dipped ; ‘yet it is taken more largely for any kind of Washing, ‘Rinsing, or Cleansing, even where there is no Dipping at all ; as *Mark* vii. 4.’ But how came either *Leigh* or himself to know, that the Things there mentioned, viz. *Cups*, *Pots*, *brazen Vessels*, and *Tables* or *Beds*, were not dipt at all in washing? The Text does not tell them so, and common Practice, as well as the Directions of the *Levitical* Law, *Lev.* vi. 28. xv. 12, 17. are plainly against them. That the Word *βαπτίζω* in some Instances out of *Classick Writers* may import no more than *Ablution* or *Washing*, we never denied: But the *Vindicator* does not produce any Instances out of such Writers wherein it signifies less than to wash, which yet would be the only Instances capable of doing him Service. He tells

tells us indeed, that *Leigh* says, ' it signifies *Sprinkling* ' or to wash one's Body sacramentally,' and refers us in the Margin to ' *Spanheim's Dub. Evangel. Pars 3. p. 69.* ' where he shews, that *Calvin's*, *Beza's*, and his own ' Opinion, is, that *Baptizo* may be properly render'd ' to *sprinkle*, and was practised by some of them.' And what's the natural Inference to be drawn from their so doing? Is it not this? That those Persons by him cited, being in the Use of *Sprinkling*, a Method which the Ancient and Scriptural Sense of the Word did not countenance, took the Freedom of introducing an Interpretation of the Text more agreeable to their own Practice. Let not the *Vindicator* think to justify himself by their Example in taking the like unwarrantable Liberty.

The *Vindicator* having attempted to shew from the *Jews* Manner of washing their Hands, that the Sense of the Word *εὐαρίδω* in *Luke xi. 38.* was only *Affusion* or *pouring Water*: I produced in my *Reply*, p. 5. a Quotation from *Godwin's Moses and Aaron*, to shew him his Mistake: In answer to which he now brings, *Vind. p. 4, 5.* the Words of *Munster* whom *Godwin* refers to, and says, ' The Accounts must be made quadrate together,' as indeed they do, for *Godwin* says, *First, they washed their Hands clean*, and *Munster* says, *Their Hands were first to be washed*, after which they both agree, *that Water was poured upon them three several Times.* So that their Accounts quadrate in confirming what is said in my *Reply*, p. 5. ' That the Washing here mentioned ' was so far from being *less* than Dipping into the Water, that it was in Reality a great deal *more.*' They also quadrate in discovering the *Vindicator's* Subtilty, who would restrict the Word *εὐαρίδω* to the Pouring of the Water, when it plainly relates to the Washing which was either antecedent to the Pouring, or, probably, very often without it.

But the *Vindicator* tells us, ' The Word *baptize* is ' therefore used passively to signify that the Action ' was performed by another upon the Person who ' washed, and not by himself. Thus *Luke xi. 38.* the ' Pharisee

‘ *Pharisee wondred that he was not first washed before*
‘ *Dinner, & πρῶτον ἐκατίσθη, and so perhaps Mark vii. 4.*
‘ *ἵνα μὴ ἐκατίσθῃς unless they be washed.*’ A notable
 Criticism! What an Oversight ’twas in our *English*
 Translators of the Bible not to hit upon it? They,
 learned as they were, seem to have thought, that an
active Rendring in those Places was of the same Import
 with the passive, and that a Man’s Hands are as properly
 said to be washed, when he has washed them himself, as
 if another did it. But they, probably, foresaw not
 what Straits the Advocates for *Sprinkling* in future Times
 might be reduced to.

Vind. p. 6. ‘ The *Replier* pass’d over what is said of
 ‘ the *Jews* washing their Hands, 2 *Kings* iii. 11. for
 ‘ *Elisba’s* ministring on *Elijah* is there expressed by his

‘ pouring Water on his Hands.’ Now how does that
 Text prove the general Manner of the *Jews* in washing
 their Hands? It may indeed shew that ’twas usual for
 the Servant to attend his Master at washing his Hands ;
 but we may reasonably suppose that ’twas as customary
 for the Servants, who probably were more in Number
 than their Masters, to wash their own Hands without
 any such Attendance.

He next produces *Eccl. xxxiv. 35. ὁ ἐκατίσθη ἀπὸ νεκροῦ, He that is washed from a dead Body, &c.* which he
 says relates to *Sprinkling*, and that ‘ the Text *Numb.*
 ‘ *xix. 19.* directs only the sprinkling the Unclean with the
 ‘ *Water of Separation.*’ In my *Reply* I transcribed Part
 of that Text to shew him, that the unclean Person was
 also to wash his Clothes; and bathe himself in Water ; for
 which he charges me both with *Ignorance* and *Inattention*,
 and with a smart *Irony* says, ‘ The judicious *Replier*
 ‘ imagines that the unclean Person that was sprinkled on
 ‘ the third and seventh Days, was likewise to wash his
 ‘ Clothes.’ This his *Civility* calls, a notorious *B. under*,
 and affirms that those Words of the Text relate to the
Sprinkler, not the *Sprinkled*, who, he says, ‘ were
 ‘ cleansed without any more ado.’ To determine this
 Difference between us, let us leave it to our Reader’s
 Judgment ;

Judgment ; in Order whereto I shall lay before him several Versions of the Text *Numb. xix. 19.*

The *Septuagint* Version reads it thus,

Καὶ περιρράνῃ ὁ κἀθαρὸς ἐπὶ τὸν ἀκάθαρτον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, καὶ ἀπαγνιθῆσεται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ, καὶ πλυνῇ τὰ ἱματῖα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λήσεται ὕδατι, καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἕως ἑσπέρας.

That of Junius and Tremellius thus,

Asperget, inquam, mundus ille immundum istum die tertio & die septimo : quumque purgaverit eum die septimo, lotis vestimentis suis abluet ille se aqua, sic mundus erit vespere.

The Vulgate Latin Edition has it,

Atque hoc modo mundus lustrabit immundum tertio & septimo die, expiatusque die septimo lavabit & se & vestimenta sua, & immundus erit usque ad vesperum.

Our common English Translation runs thus,

And the clean Person shall sprinkle upon the Unclean on the third Day, and on the seventh Day : and on the seventh Day he shall purifie himself, and wash his Clothes and bathe himself in Water, and shall be clean at Even.

I think that the Sense of all these Versions is, that the unclean Person, after his Sprinkling, on the seventh Day, was to wash his Garments, and bathe himself in Water.

In the *first* of them, do not the Words ἀπαγνιθῆσεται, πλυνῇ, λήσεται, all relate in common Construction to the Person next before mentioned, *viz.* the *Unclean* ; and do not the Words next after them, καὶ ἀκάθαρτος ἔσται ἕως ἑσπέρας, plainly favour that Construction ?

In

In the *second*, does not *abluet ille se aqua* relate to the *eum* next preceding, and does not that *eum* evidently denote the Sprinkled, not the Sprinkler?

In the *third* is it not said, *Expiatus lavabit & se & vestimenta sua*, and does not that Word *Expiatus* plainly signify the Person sprinkled?

In our *English* Translation, does not the Relative *he* naturally refer to the nearest personal Antecedent, and is not that the *Unclean*?

But the *Vindicator* tells us, that in Verse 21, 'It is ordained as a *perpetual Statute*, that he that sprinkleth the Water of Separation, shall wash his Clothes.' But how this proves that it was so ordained in the 19th Verse he has not shewn us: Besides, it may be observed, that the Sprinkler, Verse 21, was only to *wash his Clothes*: But the Sprinkled, Verse 19, was to *wash his Clothes and bathe himself in Water*. This the *Vindicator* imagines relates to the Sprinkler, not the Sprinkled, and says, that 'the Sprinkled were cleansed without any more ado.' Which Conceit of his absurdly supposes a greater Degree of Cleansing to be necessary for the *clean* Person than for the *Unclean*.

The *Vindicator* pag. 8. still insists, that the Word *καττιςμης* in *Mark* vii. 4. signifies *Sprinkling*; though I had cited several Texts proving that the Things there mentioned were by the Law directed to be washed. He now again quotes our Saviour's Words, *Luke* xi. 39, 40. *And the Lord said unto him, Now do you Pharisees make clean the Outside of the Cup and Platter, but your inward Part is full of Ravening and Wickedness. Ye Fools, did not he that made that which is without, make that which is within also.* And then queries thus, 'Now will any Man of common Sense from these Words judge otherwise than that these Vessels had only an *outward Cleansing*? Does not the Letter of the Text as plainly say *so* as Words can express?' To the former of these Queries I answer, that it is possible for Men of as good Sense as he has good Manners to judge otherwise. To the latter, I must tell him the Text doth not plainly say so.

But it plainly says, *Now*, in this case of washing your Hands, *ye Pharisees* do no other than make *clean the Outside of the Cup and Platter*, but your *inward Part* is full of *Ravening and Wickedness*. And I still think as I said in my *Reply*, p. 6, 7. our Saviour ‘condemned their
 ‘Want of inward Purity by a proverbial Speech ground-
 ‘ed on the acknowledg’d Absurdity of washing Cups
 ‘and Platters on the Outside only.’ So that ’tis not I, but the *Vindicator*, who ‘takes away’ the Foundation
 ‘which Christ went upon in the Reproof of their Hy-
 ‘pocrisy,’ for if the sprinkling the Outside only of the Cup and Platter had been all that was required in cleansing them, there could have been nothing reprobable in such a Practice, and consequently no Foundation thence for such a Reprehension.

As to the Words *διαφοροι βαπτισμοι* Heb. ix. 10. I shew’d him in my *Reply*, p. 4. that ‘the Word *diverse* there
 ‘doth not necessarily relate to different Manners of
 ‘Washing, but to the different Occasions on which they
 ‘washed, and that *diverse Washings* might be after one
 ‘Manner, viz. by *Immersion*.’ To this he now says, *Vind.* p. 10. ‘Where several things are cleansed after the
 ‘same Manner, their Cleansing cannot properly be cal-
 ‘led *diverse*, for though the Occasions of Cleansing be
 ‘different, yet the Cleansing it self is but one, as being
 ‘done all one Way.’ He should have added *and at one Time*; without which all he has said is nothing to the Purpose. For he knows that the Washings mentioned in the Texts I cited, were at different Times, as well as upon different Occasions.

But he says, *Vind.* p. 11. ‘that as Sprinkling was one
 ‘of these diverse Washings here referred to, and that
 ‘they are all expressed by the general Word *βαπτισμοι*
 ‘*Baptisms*; so it must evidently follow that *βαπτισμοι*
 ‘must include *Sprinkling* in its general Notion, which
 ‘was the Thing to be proved.’ In this, I apprehend he deals fallaciously. The Point is not what the Words *διαφοροι βαπτισμοι* *diverse Baptisms* or *Dippings* may include, when *Dipping*, *Washing*, *Rinsing*, *Purging*, and *Sprinkling*,

ling, are all together spoken of ; but the Point incumbent on him to prove is, that *Sprinkling* when used alone is *Baptism* : For though where all these Applications of Water are at one and the same Time intended or mentioned together, the Word *Baptism* or *Dipping*, being of a larger and more extensive Signification than any of the rest, may possibly include them all ; yet it will not follow that the Word *Sprinkle*, being of the least Signification there, may imply *Dipping*, which is of the largest. He argues in this Place just as rationally as if he had told us, that because a Gallon of Water includes a Pint, a Spoonful, a Drop ; therefore every Pint, Spoonful, and Drop, must denote a Gallon. But could he have prov'd, what I am persuaded he never can, that *Sprinkling* singly or alone is here called *Baptism*, it would not a whit advance his Cause ; for the *diverse Baptisms* here mentioned are called, without Exception, *carnal Ordinances imposed until the Time of Reformation*, viz. the Time of the *Gospel Dispensation*, under which they cease and are vanished away. And the Question I asked him before is still very pertinent, viz. ' If these *carnal Ordinances* of *Dipping*, ' *Washing*, *sprinkling with Water*, had been perpetuated ' by Christ's Command, with what Propriety could ' the Apostle here treat of them as only *imposed until the* ' *Time of Reformation* ? ' This Question, he knows why, he evades at present, and only says, it *will fall under Consideration in another Place* ; but is not so kind as to tell his Reader in *what Place*.

I shewed him in my *Reply*, p. 9. that the Text ' *Isai.* ' *lii. 15.* speaks not of *Sprinkling with Water*, but with ' *Astonishment*, ' and that both the *Septuagint*, and *Junius* and *Tremellius*, have so render'd it. To this he answers, *Vind.* p. 12. ' I find the Criticks on the Place ' differ very much about it.' Which is very probable, it being usual with them so to do. He adds, ' And I ' BELIEVE the *Replier* is not a greater Master in Criticism than they.' In this I concur with him, but can't think the inserting that Article of his Faith has any Relation to the Point in debate.

The *Vindicator* concludes his first Section with these Words, ‘ As to what the *Replier* says about the inward
 ‘ Cleansing that follows this Sprinkling, it is just the
 ‘ very same that we attribute to Water-baptism as the
 ‘ genuine Effects of it.’

What I then said I shall transcribe from *Reply*, pag. 9. where having recited the Text *Ezek. xxxvi. 25. Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you and ye shall be clean*, I said, ‘ These Words are indeed exprest in legal Terms,
 ‘ but the Evangelical Sense of them is plainly and fully
 ‘ subjoined in the Words next following ; *From all your
 ‘ Filthiness and from all your Idols will I cleanse you ; a new
 ‘ Heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put
 ‘ within you, and I will take away the stony Heart out of
 ‘ your Flesh, and I will give you an Heart of Flesh. And
 ‘ I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in
 ‘ my Statutes, and ye shall keep my Judgments and do them.*
 ‘ The Cleansing here spoken of is an inward Work, a
 ‘ Purgation and Renovation of the Heart, the Effect of
 ‘ the Operation of the Holy Spirit within, I will put
 ‘ my Spirit within them.’ This inward Cleansing which the Text plainly ascribes to the *Holy Spirit*, the *Vindicator* attributes to *Water-baptism* : Altho’, as I observed in my *Reply*, of which he takes no Notice, ‘ Not only
 ‘ Scripture and Reason, but the manifold Experience
 ‘ and Observation of the apparent Fruits of Thousands,
 ‘ who have been wash’d or sprinkled with Water, do
 ‘ abundantly demonstrate his Mistake therein.’

S E C T. II.

Concerning the Manner of Baptizing.

THE Texts which first fall under Consideration in this Section are *Rom. vi. 4. We are buried with him by Baptism into Death*, and *Colos. ii. 12. Buried with him in Baptism*. This Phrase, *buried by Baptism*, the *Vindicator* observes p. 13. ‘ could be taken in no Sense so consistent, as putting the Person to be baptized under Water, which represents the Burial of him, and therefore was an irrefragable Argument for Water-baptism, as well as for the Manner of baptizing. By this Construction of the Text he is, as I observed before, pulling down his own House with his own hands; for if these Texts were, as he says, *an irrefragable Argument for the Manner of Baptizing, viz. in putting the Person under Water*, would they not be an irrefragable Argument against himself, whose Practice of what he calls Baptism is in quite another Manner, viz. by *Sprinkling*? In my *Reply*, p. 10. I told him, that ‘ to me these Texts carry another Sense, and seem not to treat of Water-baptism at all,’ and accordingly shewed him the Drift and Scope of the Apostle’s Discourse, which the *Vindicator* is so far from finding fault with, that he kindly condescends to *grant me all that I contend for*; but at the same Time proposes some *Questions* which I shall endeavour to answer; his first *Query* is, ‘ If the Apostle’s Discourse does not suppose and allude to the baptized Person’s being put under Water, which is here term’d his Burial by Baptism: And if so, is it not taken for granted, is it not evident Fact, that the Apostles then baptized with Water?’ *Answer*, It appears to me, that these Texts treat not of being *baptized into Water*, but of being *baptized into Christ Jesus*, which

which the Apostle thus explains, *Rom. vi. 3. Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his Death: By this Baptism into his Death we are said to be buried with him, by the same figurative way of speaking as in Verse 6, our old Man is said to be crucified with him, by which Phrase is expressly denoted a Destruction of the Body of Sin; that henceforth we should not serve Sin.* That the Metaphors *Baptize* and *Baptism* in these Texts might allude to the Practice of *Water-baptism* well known to have been used among the *Jews*, as well as by *John the Baptist* and some of *Christ's Disciples*, we deny not; though this doth not prove the Apostles to be *then* in the Practice of *Water-baptism*: But the Apostle's Discourse here plainly shews, that a being baptized into Christ, is not by *Baptism* into Water, but by *Baptism into his Death*, viz. *a being dead unto Sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* His second Query is, 'If there had not been such a Practice subsisting in those Days, as this way of baptizing, would ever the Apostle have supposed it or referred to it, or the People have understood him?' *Answer*, If it was well known in those Days that such a Practice once subsisted, the Apostle might as well refer to it, and the People as well understand him, as if it had *then* subsisted. His *third* Query, being only a Repetition of his *second* in other Words, needs no other Reply.

These Texts then, though the Words may allude to the Practice of *Water-baptism*, most plainly shew another kind of Baptism, viz. a Conformity to the Death and Resurrection of Christ, by our being *buried*, not *under Water*, but unto Sin, and a being raised again, not out of the *Water*, but unto *Newness of Life*.

The *Vindicator* still insists, p. 15. that the *Circumcision of Christ*, mentioned *Colos. ii. 11, 12.* is to be understood of *Water-baptism*. But the Text it self is expressly against him, which explains it to be, the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, which *Water baptism* is not; beside 'tis said to be, ἀχειροτόμητον, made without Hands, and I dare say, the *Vindicator* will never shew, that *Water-baptism* is so made. The

The *Baptism*, or Circumcision of Christ, is not made with Hands, but spiritual; so *Justin Martyr*, as cited by Dr. *Wall*, tells *Trypho* the Jew, καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ διὰ τὴν προχωρήσαντες τῷ θεῷ, ἢ ταυτὴν τὴν κατὰ σὰρκα παρελάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν Ἐνὼχ καὶ οἱ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν. *We also who by him have had Access to God, have not receiv'd this carnal Circumcision, but the spiritual Circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed.* The *Vindicator*, I suppose, will not undertake to prove that *Enoch* and *those like him* were in the Practice of Water-baptism.

The *Vindicator*, p. 16. after reciting the Text Rom. ii. 28, 29. *He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that Circumcision which is outward in the Flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and Circumcision is that of the Heart in the Spirit, and not in the Letter, whose Praise is not of Men but of God.* says, 'That there was an *inward* as well as an *outward* Circumcision,' and that 'the *outward* Circumcision was not to be omitted,' which might indeed have been the Case during the Continuance of the Legal Dispensation; but when the Apostle wrote this, the Case was alter'd, and the outward Circumcision was to be omitted under the pure and spiritual Dispensation of the Gospel; a Dispensation of Substance, not of Ceremonies. And seeing Water-baptism was a meer external and shadowy Ceremony, as well as Circumcision, the Argument of the Apostle is as conclusive for the Cessation of the one as of the other.

In my first *Answer* to him I had observed, that 'if Christ had instituted any Water-baptism at all, he would never have left it to be Matter of perpetual Dispute and Altercation, to whom, by whom, where, when, and after what Manner it should be administred.' He in his *Defence* answer'd, 'That the *to whom* and by whom were determined, for as to the *to whom*, all Nations were to be baptized, and as to the *by whom*, the Commission was given to the Apostles.' Which *Answer*,

swer, I said in my Reply, was far from proving that any Man now has it. This Reply he takes home to himself, and says, *Vind.* p. 17. I replied that they (viz. himself and his Brethren) cannot prove that now a-days they have Commission to baptize. Well, how does he perform this? He says, 'That the Apostles had Successors, which were and are the Bishops, the primitive Writers abundantly testify.' How is that possible? The primitive Writers might indeed trace a Succession of the Bishops which were in their Times: But how could they trace a Succession of Bishops which now are? Certainly, this are either crept in inadvertently, or the *Vindicator* must suppose that the primitive Writers were favour'd with a special Revelation for the Discovery of so important a Pedigree through a Futurity of so many Ages. Now let's hear what these primitive Writers say: He first cites *Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* saying, 'The Apostles having it revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ that Contentions would arise about the Name of Bishop, for this reason ordained Bishops and Deacons, and gave them this Precept, that upon their Death other approved Men should succeed in their Ministry.' The next is *Irenæus*, 'We can reckon up those who by the Apostles were made Bishops in the Churches, and their Successors to our own Times.' Perhaps the *Vindicator* took our own Times in this Place for the present Times, instead of those of *Irenæus*. 'They would have them perfect and unreprouable in all Things whom they left to be their Successors.' Could our Clergy have derived their Succession through a Line of such good Men, they need not have said, as in the 26th Article of Religion, 'That * sometime the Evil have chief Authority in the Administration of the Word and Sacraments.' His third Writer is *Tertullian*, whom he cites, speaking of Baptism, thus, 'That the Chief Priest, (meaning the Bishop) has Power to give it, and from him Presbyters and Deacons.'

From

From the Testimonies produced he infers, *Vind.* p. 18. that ' it is plain, that the Apostles had some to succeed ' them in the several Functions of their Ministry, which ' if they had the Commission to baptize, given by Christ, ' must of course descend to them, and to all others whom ' they constituted to perform it.' Here he stops, but should have proceeded, could he have seen his Way, to shew that *himself* and his *Brethren* are the Persons so constituted, without which, all he has said is nothing to the Purpose.

He proceeds next to Scripture Testimony in Proof of this pretended Succession; the Texts he cites or refers to, are *Mat.* xxviii. 20. *And lo, I am with you alway, unto the End of the World.* *John* xx. 21. *As my Father sent me, so send I you.* *1 Tim.* ii. 2. *The Things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.*

These Texts he produces as proving a standing Succession of Ministers outwardly called and ordained by Men; a Matter to which they have no Relation, as may appear by duly considering them.

Mat. xxviii. 20. *And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World.* Christ himself had thoroughly explicated the Manner of his Presence with them *to the End of the World*, in these Words, *John* xiv. 16. *And I will pray the Father and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you for ever, even the Spirit of Truth.* From this Spirit of Truth, ever abiding with them, the true Evangelical Ministers receive their Commission, not by any outward Ordination or Succession from Men, but Christ himself sends them, as his Father sent him.

John xx. 21. Christ says, *As my Father sent me, so send I you.* But how did his Father send him? By putting his Spirit upon him? *Mat.* xii. 18. *I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall shew Judgment to the Gentiles.* And accordingly he sent his Disciples, *by putting his Spirit upon them,* *John* xx. 22. *He breathed on them and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost.* 'Tis from the Inspiration

of the holy Spirit that all true Evangelical Ministers have their *Mission*. 'Tis the Lord of the Harvest only that sends forth Labourers into his Harvest.

2 Tim. ii. 2. The Apostle Paul says to Timothy, *The Things thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* This Text contains an Exhortation to Timothy to be strong in the Grace that is in Christ Jesus, and to preach the Doctrine of the Gospel, signifying, that thro' his Ministry faithful Men should be raised up, and made able also to teach others. Here's not a Word of human Ordination: The plain Import of the Place is, that faithful Men should be made able, through the Assistance of the holy Spirit, to teach others. But remarkable is the *Vindicator's* Perversion of this Text when he says, 'Timothy had a Power delegated to him from St. Paul to deliver over that sacred *Depositum* of divine Truths to such Persons as he thought worthy to be trusted with it; or, in other Words, to ordain those he thought worthy to the Ministry.' So that by leaving out the Words of the Text *faithful Men*, and inserting the Words, *such Persons as he* (Timothy) *thought worthy*, the *Vindicator* attempts to discard the Call of the holy Spirit, and to introduce an human Ordination, depending on the Judgment and Will of Man. But, pray, what does the *Vindicator* mean by 'that sacred *Depositum* of divine Truths,' which only some Persons 'were worthy to be trusted with?' Was not the Gospel to be preached to all Nations? Are not the divine Truths thereof exhibited to all? Is there any peculiar *Depositum* of divine Truths to be communicated to a particular Set of Men exclusive of all others? Either let him shew us from the Doctrine of the New Testament what this *Depositum* is; or he will have no just Cause to blame us for thinking it a meer Pretence of *Empirick* Divines, who, like *Quacks* in *Physick*, endeavour to raise unto themselves a Reputation among the Vulgar, by spreading a meer Imagination of their being in Possession of a *Nostrum*.

That

That Promise of our Saviour, *And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World*, shews the continued Presence of his holy Spirit to qualify, call, and ordain his Ministers, whom in all Times he instructs and sends in one and the same manner, on one and the same Errand, viz. *To turn Men from Darkneſs to Light*. Ministers thus called and sent need no human Ordination; and unless they be thus sent, their Commission from Men is vain. Men indeed may send one another on their own Errands, to preach up human Inventions and empty Ceremonies, such as Infant-sprinkling appears to be; and Ministers so sent may proselyte others to the Party and Interest of themselves and those who send them: But the Ministers of Christ have *neither Part nor Lot in this matter*. Christ, ever present with them, sends them on another Message, *namely*, to direct all Nations to his holy Spirit, the alone Gospel Baptizer and Purifier of the Souls of Men, through the Blood of Christ, *purging their Conſciences from dead Works to ſerve the living God*.

From what is before ſaid, I think 'tis plain, the *Vindicator* has yet left it very obſcure and undetermin'd, both *to whom*, and *by whom*, Water-baptiſm is now a-days to be adminiſtered: As to the Time *when*, the Place *where*, and the Manner *how*, he plainly owns them, p. 20, 21, to be left undetermined, and ſays, 'they were only 'Circumſtances,' and 'do not enter into the Nature 'of the Thing.' But in that he miſtakes, for the Nature of the Thing is circumſtantial. Water-baptiſm it ſelf is but an external Ceremony, and conſiſts of Circumſtances. Alter the Circumſtances and the Thing it ſelf is changed. Take them away, and it is not. 'Tis therefore apparent, that Chriſt did not inſtitute Water-baptiſm, becauſe he neither mentions *Water*, nor determin'd the Circumſtances whereof that Ceremony muſt conſiſt. The *Vindicator* indeed aſſerts, that 'Men are 'not left under Obſcurity or Confuſion,' notwithſtanding ſuch Uncertainty. But that Aſſertion of his is more than ſufficiently contradicted by the Variety of Opinions and contentious Diſputes that are known to have been

about it, to the Reproach of the Christian Religion, and the Neglect of the true spiritual Baptism, which would have sanctified their Hearts, and have influenced their Conversations to a Conduct more agreeable to the Gospel of Peace.

Against our interpreting the Commission of Christ, *Mat. xxviii. 19.* to relate to this spiritual Baptism, he queries, ‘ Is it in any Man’s Power now, or was it in any Man’s Power heretofore, to baptize with the Holy Ghost ? ’ To which I answer, that though the Baptism with the holy Ghost, or purifying of the Heart, is not to be effected by meer human Power ; yet it pleased God, and still doth please him, to accompany the Ministry of those he sends with the Power of his own Spirit, and to make them the instrumental Means in his Hand to perform, what otherwise they could not by any human Power have effected : Thus the Ministers of Christ are sent by him, as *Paul* was, *to turn Men from Darkness to Light, and from the Power of Satan unto God, that they may receive Forgiveness of Sins ;* which yet neither is nor was within the Reach of meer human Power to perform. But is it not strange that this *Vindicator*, whom I suppose to be a Minister of the Church of *England*, should ask such a Question ? Let me propose a like Query to himself : Is it in any Man’s Power now, or was it in any Man’s Power heretofore, to *forgive Sins* ? Certainly it is not : Yet do not himself and his Brethren ordinarily in their Visitations of the Sick pronounce these Words ? ‘ By his [Christ’s] Authority committed unto me I absolve thee from all thy Sins in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost.’ Now ’tis *God only that can absolve from Sin* ; yet does the Minister pronounce that himself does it by Virtue of that Authority from Christ which he pretends to, (perhaps presumptuously) but which the Apostles certainly had, and might therefore *baptize with the holy Ghost*.

The *Vindicator* queries again, ‘ Will it not be a great Absurdity to be baptized with the *holy Ghost* in the Name of the *holy Ghost* ? ’ This is an Absurdity of his

his own making, which the Text gives no ground for. I suppose he will allow that the Word *Baptizing*, by a plain and easy Metaphor, may signify *Converting*, and 'tis easy to shew, that in the Name of any one doth frequently import by his Power or Authority. The Text then, without the least Absurdity or Tautology, will read thus, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, converting them from their Sins, in the Name (or by the Power) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost.* This Rendering is very agreeable with the Account of this Commission given in *Luke xxiv. 47.* where our Saviour mentions not the Word *baptizing*, but says, *that Repentance and Remission of Sins should be preached in his Name, or by his Power, not their own:* Which also exactly corresponds with the Saying of the Apostle Paul, *1 Cor. i. 14. Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.*

But the *Vindicator* tells us, by way of Query, p. 23. that the Apostles were *visible Creatures*, and were to do an outward *visible Thing*, to *teach all Nations.* Which is very true: But he supposes they were 'to do another *outward visible Action*, viz. to *baptize with Water*; and that they were to utter *audible Words*, and to pronounce this Baptism to be in the Name of the Father, Son, and holy Ghost.' In which I cannot agree with him; *first*, because it doth not appear by Scripture, that ever any of the Apostles did audibly pronounce that Form of Words in Baptism: And *secondly*, *Baptizing* is here mentioned as concomitant with their *Preaching*, not as another outward Action to be separately performed. Now, though the *spiritual Baptism*, or *inward Cleansing the Hearts of their Hearers*, did accompany their Ministry, through the Power of God present with them, yet was not that Power restricted to their *Preachings* or any external Performances, nor is under any particular Limitations of Time, Place, Manner, or any outward human Method of Administration. *The Wind*, says our Saviour, *bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the Sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth:* So is every one that is born of the Spirit.

In p. 24, 25, and to the End of this Section, he treats of the Text *Mat. iii. 12. Whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Floor, and gather his Wheat into the Garner; but will burn up the Chaff with unquenchable Fire*; of which Words I had said in my *Reply*, p. 16. that ‘they have a Connexion with and Relation to the foregoing Words, *he shall baptize you with the holy Ghost and with Fire.*’ The *Vindicator* now tells us what we well knew before, that ‘Commentators refer this Text either to the Destruction of the *Jews*, or a Separation of good Men at the Day of Judgment.’ Their Authority weighs little in a Case they can’t agree about. Had he shewn wherein I had misinterpreted this Text, or that the Sense I gave of it was not agreeable to the Predictions of the Prophets by me cited concerning the *Messiah*, he had done something. But he cannot reasonably expect, that the Concurrence of this Text with the Predictions of the ancient Prophets, should carry less weight with me than the disagreeing Sentiments of some modern Commentators.

S E C T. III.

Concerning Christ's Commission to baptize.

THE *Vindicator* in his former *Defence* had urg'd me to shew any manifest Absurdity in interpreting the Text *Mat. xxviii. 19, of Water-baptism*, which accordingly I endeavoured in my *Reply*, p. 19, 20, to do, by arguing as follows, *viz.*

- ‘1. To be admitted into the *Christian Church* is to be put into a *State of Holiness*: Now that which makes a Man neither more holy nor less wicked than he was before, cannot put him into a *State of Holiness*: But outward washing with Water neither makes a Man more holy nor less wicked than he was before: And consequently

‘ consequently ’tis absurd to suppose, that Water-baptism is a necessary Means of Admission into Christ’s Church.

‘ 2. Whatsoever Christ instituted, was in order to answer the great End of his Coming into the World, which was *to save his People from their Sins*, Mat. i. 21. But outward washing with Water conduces not to the taking away Sin : Therefore ’tis absurd to suppose, that outward washing with Water is any Institution of Christ.

‘ 3. Christ did not institute the very same Thing which he came to abolish : But *Water-baptism* was one of those ritual ceremonial and carnal Ordinances of the *Jews* which he came to abolish : Consequently ’tis absurd to suppose, that he instituted it.

‘ 4. The Apostle *Paul* thanked God that he had baptized so few of the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. i. 14. Now if Christ had commanded Water-baptism, is it not a plain Absurdity to suppose, that the Apostle thanked God that he had so seldom executed Christ’s Command ?

To the first of these Arguments the *Vindicator* objects, that ‘ there is a Defect in Form,’ and that it is not a ‘ right Categorical Syllogism,’ which may be very true, for ’twas never intended so to be : The *Replier* never meant to confine himself to *Logical* Niceties. ’Tis enough for him that the Consequences he draws, though not subtil nor sophistical, are plain and natural. The *Vindicator* says indeed, that the *Replier* ‘ changed the Terms of his minor Proposition in his Conclusion, and puts *Water-baptism* instead of *outward washing with Water*.’ I was indeed so ignorant as to think, that *Water baptism* and *outward washing with Water* were one and the same Thing. But this subtil *Logician*, after an Addition of his own to one of those Terms only, asserts, p. 29, that ‘ *outward washing with Water*, simply considered, and *Water-baptism*, are two different Things.’ Now that Difference is of his own making, by a Fallacy which any Man, not blinded with *Logick*, may discover,
by

by putting his Addition to the other Term also ; for then *outward washing with Water*, simply considered, and *Water-baptism*, simply considered, are still but one Thing, which to common Capacities would be a sufficient Proof that they were but one Thing before. But he does not well to slander me, in saying that I deny that *Baptism is the Means to make us more holy* ; for what I said related only to *Water-baptism*, which at the most is but a Sign of that Baptism *which makes Men holy*. I admit that the *Baptism* which Christ instituted, makes Men holy ; but deny that to be *Water-baptism* because it makes not holy. 'Tis observable that the *Vindicator* is himself frequently culpable of what he causlessly charg'd me with, *viz.* a Changing of Terms, and shifting from *Baptism* to *Water-baptism*, using those Terms promiscuously without Distinction, to cover his attributing to *Water-baptism*, the Sign, that which is spoken only of *Baptism*, the Substance or Thing signified. He grants, ' that the washing with Water, considered in it self, can ' have no internal Effect upon the Soul,' in which I agree with him ; but he adds, ' Yet it may by Christ's ' Ordinance be an instituted Means to that End.' What may be, may not be ; 'tis his business to prove that it is so. He proceeds, ' The outward Circumcision ' practised by the *Jews*, abstractedly considered, could ' no way affect the Mind, and yet by God's Appoint- ' ment it plainly did.' He does not, and I suppose cannot, produce any Text of Scripture proving this Point, *viz.* *That God did appoint outward Circumcision to affect the Mind*. I take it therefore for his bare say so. He goes on thus, ' The River *Jordan* could not of its self, ' or by its own Virtue cure *Naaman* of his Leprosy, ' nor washing in the Pool of *Siloam* restore Sight to the ' Blind, and yet these, by the concurring Power and ' Operation of God, effected these Cures: Even so ' washing the Body in Baptism may, and does, by the ' same Power and Operation of God, purify and heal ' all the Maladies of our Souls.' Here he ascribes to Water-Baptism now a-days, the same miraculous Power by

by which *Naaman* was cured, and the Blind restored to Sight; and thereby (as I observed in the *Preface* to my *Reply*) doth contradict our Adversaries darling Notion, that *Miracles are ceased*. But his Comparison doth not hold; for the Cures of *Naaman*, and of the blind Man, were visible and apparent to all that knew them, both before and after, and the Truth of the Miracles wrought was confirm'd by the Evidence of their Senses. But in the Case of Water-baptism, the clear Testimony and Evidence of the Senses of those who know many of the Persons concerned, directly contradict the *Vindicator's* Assertion, and plainly prove that no Cure at all is wrought, but that they continue, notwithstanding their Water-baptism, as prophane, as leprous, and as full of Maladies, as if they had never been washed at all.

We are next to consider the Texts he produces to prove that Water-baptism makes Men holy.

1. Ephes. v. 25, 26. *Even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it, with the washing of Water, by the Word.* That the Cleansing here spoken of is not outward Washing may appear by comparing the Text with a parallel Expression of the same Apostle, Titus ii. 14. *Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all Iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar People, zealous of good Works.* Where no mention is made of Water. The Words *washing with Water by the Word* are but a figurative Expression, denoting the cleansing Quality of the Word, not outward Water; as the sincere Milk of the Word, 1 Pet. ii. 2. denotes not outward Milk, but the comforting and strengthening Quality of the Word.

2. 1 Cor. vi. 11. *But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the Name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.* The *Vindicator* tells us, that 'some Commentators say, that to be all these in the Name of the Lord, is to be so by taking upon them the Profession of the Christian Religion in Baptism.' A gross Conceit; which admits no Distinction betwixt the Shell and the Kernel of Religion; betwixt the Name

of Christianity and the *Nature* of it; betwixt *Water-baptism*, the Shadow, and *real Baptism*, the very Substance of Christianity; but would make the Hypocrite a Saint, and reconcile, if possible, Christ with *Belial*. But the manifest Purport of the Apostle's Discourse in that Place, is to recommend real and substantial *Holiness*, not the bare Name or Profession of it.

3. Acts ii. 38. *Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the holy Ghost.* ' Here then, says the *Vindicator*, ' the Reception of the holy Ghost is ' an *Effect of Baptism.*' He should have said, had he argued fairly, of *Water-baptism*. But that would not have agreed with his own next Words, *viz.* ' Now ' where that blessed Spirit is received into our Hearts, ' there, no doubt in the World, but we are made holy ' by it.' In which he says true, but against himself; for if such Holiness be through the Work of the blessed Spirit in our Hearts, 'tis not to be ascribed to *outward washing with Water.*

4. John iii. 5. *Except a Man be born of Water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God,* ' Here, ' says the *Vindicator*, the *Replier* allows that to be made ' holy is an Effect of being born of the Spirit, and if to ' be born of Water, in this Place, be meant *Baptism with Water*, as shall be proved afterwards, then Holiness is to be ascribed to *Baptism.*' He should have added *with Water.* But in this Argument he has chang'd his Terms more than once; the Term *being born of the Spirit* in his *Major Proposition* is turn'd into being born of Water in his *Minor*, and the Term *Baptism with Water* in his *Minor Proposition*, is turn'd into *Baptism* without mentioning Water in his Conclusion. But perhaps so expert a *Logician*, vers'd in *Academical Learning*, may be indulg'd a Liberty, which in a *Quaker* he would certainly call *Chopping of Logick*, and sternly reprove, with a *Ne Sutor ultra Crepidam*: But let that pass, and observe how he proves that *born of Water*, John iii. 5. is to be understood of *Water-baptism.* ' I think, says he, the

next

‘ next Text will make it appear,’ and then cites *Titus* iii. 5. *He saved us by the washing of Regeneration and the Renewing of the holy Ghost.* But that this *washing of Regeneration* is *Water-baptism* he proves not, except by telling us, that *Dr. Wall* observes that the Ancient Fathers used it in that Sense. But as their Opinion can be no Rule to us ; we had better interpret this Text by comparing it with other Passages of the *inspired* Writers in holy Writ. The *Washing* here spoken of is that by which *Christ* saves us. *Of his Mercy he saved us by the Washing of Regeneration*, a parallel Expression to which we find, *Rev.* i. 5. *He loved us, and washed us from our Sins in his own Blood.* Or, as it is in *Heb.* ix. 16. *He put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself.* The Scripture doth not attribute the *Washing* by which we are saved to *outward* or *Elementary Water*, but to the *Blood of Christ*. The Apostle *Peter* also has an Expression of the very same Import with the Text under Consideration, *viz.* *1 Pet.* i. 2. *Elect, through Sanctification of the Spirit unto Obedience, and Sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ.* Where the Word *Elect* signifies the same with *saved*: *The sprinkling of the Blood of Christ*, the same with *the washing of Regeneration* ; and the *Sanctification of the Spirit unto Obedience*, the same with the *Renewing of the holy Ghost*. If the Ancient Fathers did use the Word *Regeneration* for *Water-baptism*, yet ’tis apparent the inspired Writers of holy Scripture did not use the Word in that Sense ; whence it is natural to infer, that those Fathers were early degenerated, and had entertained Notions very different from those of the Apostles : And that what *Dr. Wall* says of two of them may very probably be true of more, that ‘ * They were (tho’ very learned Men) singular in their Opinions, and fell into great and monstrous Errors in the Faith.’ And ’tis certainly no small Error to ascribe the *taking away of Sin*, the pure and spiritual Effect of the *Blood of Christ*, to any Creature, or any Thing of a meer external and elementary Nature.

D 2

Having

Having thus clear'd my *first* Argument from the *Vindicator's* Objections, I proceed to the *second*, viz. 'What-
 ' ever Christ instituted was in order to answer the great
 ' End of his Coming into the World, which was to
 ' *save his People from their Sins*, Mat. i. 21. But outward
 ' washing with Water conduces not to the taking away
 ' Sin: Therefore 'tis absurd to suppose, that out-
 ' ward washing with Water is any Institution of Christ.'

Here the *Vindicator* again schools me for blundering in *Logick*: And I, as becomes me, humbly submit to his superior Judgment in point of Form, and patiently attend his Objections to the Matter of my Argument; which he smartly attacks p. 32, thus, 'Let us see whether Water-baptism does not take away Sin.' To prove that it does, he proceeds, 'Now Sin may be considered either as Original or Actual.' He knows that Infants, the Subjects of what he practises as Water-baptism, have no actual Sin to take away; and therefore insists upon what he calls *Original Sin*, and says, 'That there is an original Corruption in our Natures, called in Latin, *Peccatum Originis*, Birth-sin, is plain from *Psal. li. 5.* and *Rom. v. 12.*' and other Texts which he refers to. He says also p. 33. 'That *Infants* having contracted a Guilt from the Womb, they are liable to Punishment for the same, unless it be taken away.' He queries, 'How the Guilt of this Original Sin is taken away, and we are put into a salvable State? For, says he, till such Time as this is done, we are in a very desperate Condition, and without God's gracious and uncovenanted Mercy, liable to Damnation.' This Doctrine is the *Basis* and *Foundation* of the pretended Necessity of baptizing Infants with *Water*. Remove the Foundation and the Building falls. This Doctrine then is directly contrary to the whole Tenour of the Gospel, which is a *Covenant* of the *Mercy* of God exhibited to every Creature under Heaven, Col. i. 23. A *Covenant of common Salvation*, by which all Mankind, without Exception, are put into a salvable State; *God will have ALL Men to be saved*, 1 Tim. ii. 4. Christ gave himself a Ran-

a Ransom for ALL, Verſ. 6. God is the Saviour of ALL Men, 1 Tim. iv. 10. The Body of Jeſus Chriſt was offered once for ALL, Heb. x. 10. He by the Grace of God taſted Death for every Man, Heb. ii. 9. I am far from the Vindicator's Opinion, that ' Infants are, or ever were, ' liable to Punishment for Guilt contracted from the ' Womb: ' Yet were that Affertion as true, as I think it falſe and antiſcriptural, 'tis clear from Scripture, that all ſuch Guilt is taken away and removed by the Death of Chriſt, who hath put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himſelf, Heb. ix. 26. by Virtue of which Sacrifice, all Mankind are now born, and continue in a State of Reconciliation with God, until they become alienated by actual Tranſgreſſion; for as ſaith the Apoſtle, 2 Cor. v. 19. God was in Chriſt reconciling the World unto himſelf, not imputing their Trefpaſſes unto them. To determine therefore, that all Infants, dying before actual Tranſgreſſion, are undoubtedly ſaved, is not ' to be wiſe above what is written.' There is very good reaſon to think, that ſome Men do willingly countenance among the People this erroneous Notion of an imaginary Guilt where none is, for the Sake of their own Intereſt, in adminiſtring to innocent Infants a Ceremony to them altogether unneceſſary; ſeeing they are without it in a State of Grace, under the covenanted Mercy of God, ſecure from Condemnation, and Partakers of the great Salvation that's come by Jeſus Chriſt, the Propitiation for the Sins of the whole World, 1 John ii. 5.

But ſeeing the Vindicator has recited ſome Texts, and referred to others, to prove this abſurd Doctrine of the Imputation of Original Sin to Infants, let us conſider them. Pſal. li. 5. Behold, I was ſhapen in Iniquity, and in Sin did my Mother conceive me. In which, the Sin ſeems rather aſcribed to the Mother than the Child.

2. Rom. v. 12. Wherefore as by one Man Sin entred into the World, and Death by Sin, and ſo Death paſſed upon all Men, for that all have ſinned. The Force of this Text, as applied by him, is fully taken away in the ſame Chapter, Verſe 15, If through the Offence of One
many

many be dead, much more the Grace of God, and the Gift by Grace. which is by one Man Jesus Christ, bath abounded unto many. And Verse 18, *As by the Offence of One Judgment came upon all Men unto Condemnation; even so by the Righteousness of One, the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life.*

3. Gen. vi. 5. *And God saw that the Wickedness of Man was great in the Earth, and that every Imagination of the Thoughts of his Heart was only evil continually.* How this relates to Original or Birth-sin, is not easie to discover, unless the *Vindicator* will suppose, that they were working, and contriving Wickedness, as soon as they were born.

4. Job. xiv. 4. *Who can bring a clean Thing out of an unclean?* This, the *Septuagint* Version renders thus, *Τίς γὰρ καθάρος ἔσται ἀπὸ ρύπου. Αλλ' ἰδεὶς, For who is clean from Pollution, not one.* Which Text, if spoken at all of Infants, speaks of them in a State from which they are redeem'd by Christ.

5. Rom. xiii. 10. &c. in which Chapter I cannot perceive any Thing relating to this Subject.

6. Rom. v. 14. *Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses: But then read Verse 21, As Sin bath reigned unto Death, even so might Grace reign through Righteousness unto eternal Life by Jesus Christ our Lord.*

7. Ephes. ii. 3. *And were by Nature the Children of Wrath even as others.* In which Place the Context manifestly shews, that the Apostle speaks not at all of Original or Birth-sin, but of actual Transgression, of a State wherein they had their Conversation in Times past in the Lusts of the Flesh, fulfilling the Desires of the Flesh and of the Mind.

He cites, pag. 33, 34. several Texts to prove that Water-baptism takes away Sin, as *Acts* ii. 38. *Eph.* v. 26. *Tit.* iii. 5. *Rom.* vi. 3, 4. *John* iii. 5. All which, that they relate not to Water-baptism we have already shewn. For as himself truly says p. 33. 'Now it is by the Assistance of the holy Ghost that we overcome all Sin and arrive at a State of Holiness, for of our meer
'selves

‘ *selves we are able to do nothing, but it is this divine Spirit that works in us both to will and to do of his good Pleasure.*’ In which he says well, but much against himself; who ascribes overcoming Sin, and entering into a State of Holiness, to *Water baptism*, an outward Ceremony, which of *our own meer selves we are able either to do or leave undone.* The Words *wash away thy Sins, Acts xxii. 16.* cannot mean Water baptism, because, as we have already shewn, the Scripture ascribes such *washing* to the *Blood of Christ.* The *Vindicator* mentions one Text more, p. 34. and says, ‘ We are said by it (Water-baptism) *to put on Christ, Gal. iii. 27.*’ But to shew his Mistake herein, let us consider the Import of the Phrase *put on Christ*; which is interpreted by the Apostle himself, *Rom. xiii. 14.* to be the *not making Provision for the Flesh to fulfil the Lusts thereof.* The Words of the Text, *Gal. iii. 27.* are, *As many of you as are baptized into Christ have put on Christ*; I presume the *Vindicator* will hardly venture to affirm of all who are baptized with Water, *that they make no Provision for the Flesh to fulfil the Lusts thereof.*

Vind. pag. 34. he attacks my *third Argument, viz.* ‘ Christ did not institute the same Thing which he came to abolish; but Water-baptism was one of those ritual, ceremonial, and carnal Ordinances of the *Jews* which he came to abolish; consequently it is absurd to suppose that he instituted it.’ In answer to this he insinuates, that Baptism for *Profelytism* was not that Law which God instituted, but a meer Tradition of the *Jews* which they had no divine Command for when they took up the Usage of it; whence he infers, that ‘ if Christ did abolish the other diverse Washings for the different Sorts of Uncleaness which were instituted by God’s Command to *Moses*, he could not be said to abolish this which had no such positive Institution.’ And says, ‘ That ’tis probable our Saviour, abolishing those different Washings, did select Baptism for *Profelytism*, and institute it for an higher End.’ Again, ‘ Our Saviour, as he built the Christian on the Jewish Church, sure

' sure *might* adopt one Rite from the many in it, the more
 ' readily to gain the *Jews*, especially when he added a
 ' peculiar Virtue and Efficacy to it, and improved it
 ' from a Ceremony into a Sacrament.' Again, ' Tho'
 ' the Ceremonial Law, which was a Shadow of good
 ' Things to come, did cease of course by the Coming
 ' of Christ, yet he *might* continue one peculiar Signifi-
 ' cative Rite in Use among the *Jews*, by giving it a
 ' fresh Sanction and Establishment, and improving it
 ' to a much nobler Design than it was used for under
 ' the *Jewish* Church, without the Imputation of a gross
 ' Absurdity.' Which last Words would insinuate a
 gross, tho' sly, Abuse of me, who am far from apply-
 ing the Word *absurd* to any Institution of Christ; tho' I
 might, and did very properly, apply it to the *Vindica-*
tor's mistaken Suppositions concerning what I do not ad-
 mit to be so. 'Tis observable, that in the Passages last
 cited, he expresses himself with a more than ordinary
 Degree of Caution; putting the Issue of the main Point
 he ought to prove upon such Probabilities and Possibi-
 lities, as have no solid Foundation. For though he may
 say, 'tis probable, yet 'tis indeed highly improbable,
 that our Saviour should select, and with a peculiar Ho-
 nour prefer a Traditional Ceremony of the *Jews* before
 those of Divine Appointment; that he should abolish
 those *Washings* which God instituted, and add a peculiar
 Virtue and Efficacy to that which the *Jews* of their own
 Superstition had invented. This is gross enough; but
 observe what follows: He does not barely suppose,
 but takes for granted, that *Christ built the Christian on*
the Jewish Church. A bold Assertion, but contradicto-
 ry to Scripture, which assures us that the Church is built
 upon Christ himself; the Apostle *Paul* is express in
 this Point, and says, *Other Foundation can no Man lay,*
than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ, 1 Cor. iii. 11.
 But the *Vindicator* substitutes another Foundation, viz.
 the *Jewish* Church. Henceforth I shall not wonder to
 hear a Man, that hath such *antiscriptural* Notions of the
 Christian Church's Foundation, express never so gross
 Sentiments concerning the Superstructure.

However, as he has here prov'd nothing, either of his Assertions or Suppositions, my Argument continues in its full Force.

He comes at length, p. 35, to my *fourth* Argument, viz. 'The Apostle *Paul* thanked God he had baptized 'so few of the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. i. 14. Now, if 'Christ had commanded Water-baptism, is it not a 'plain Absurdity to suppose, that the Apostle thanked 'God that he had so seldom executed Christ's Command?' The *Vindicator* acknowledges that this Text, taken by it self, might be the Foundation of a plausible Argument against Water-baptism; but will have the Context to import otherwise: He tells us, 'That there were 'great Divisions among the *Corinthians*,' occasioned by 'adhering to their respective Baptizers,' and that 'St. 'Paul therefore, because he had converted and baptized 'so few, thanks God, not for that, but because he had 'not been an Instrument in the Separation then on foot.' This shews, that Water-baptism was accounted the Badge of a Sect or Party of Men, for which Reason the Apostle seldom us'd it, lest he should be thought to seek the Gaining Profelytes to himself: A Reason not sufficient to have excus'd him in the Omission of an express Command of Christ, and therefore to put the Matter out of doubt, he says positively, Verse 17, *Christ sent me not to baptize*. Which shews, that the Commission of Christ, *Mat.* xix. 27. related not to Water-baptism. What the *Vindicator* says of *Paul's* baptizing with Water many in the Churches of *Asia* and *Macedonia*, is *gratis dictum*; and needs no Reply, the Scriptures Silence therein justly reproving his Loquacity.

The *Vindicator's* next Attempt is to answer a large Quotation I had cited from *R. Barclay's* Apology, which he first prudently contracts into a few Lines, seeing it easier to leave out that Author's Reasoning than to confute it. The Point he ought to prove is, 'That Water-baptism, a CARNAL ORDINANCE in the Time of the 'Law, is now become a Spiritual One.' But instead of that, he insists on the Necessity of continuing that carnal

Ordinance under the Gospel, by telling us, pag. 39, that 'the Church being a *visible Society*, something '*visible* must be done to admit a Member into it.' Suppose this were true, for it is not Scriptural, yet his *something* would prove *nothing*, because what he says would be equally applicable to any *visible Act* whatsoever. He adds, 'The *Jewish Church* had Circumcision 'appointed for that End.' What then? 'As the 'Christian, *says he*, is no other than a Superstructure 'upon that, it must needs be very expedient, if not 'necessary, that something external, like that, must 'be instituted as a Means of Admission into it.' But if, as I have already prov'd by Scripture, his Assertion, 'That the Christian Church is no other than a Super- 'structure upon the Jewish,' be a *gross and fundamental Error*, all his Pretence of Expediency and Necessity falls to the Ground. His telling us, p. 39, 'That the 'Body is as much a Part of Man as his Soul, and is to 'be saved as well as his Soul,' and that 'the Soul can 'outwardly express no Act of Religion but by the Bo- 'dy,' is very far from shewing, that washing of the Body has any Effect upon the Soul: 'Tis indeed true, as himself says, that 'the Soul is the Seat of Religion,' and it follows from thence, that through it Religion is communicated to the Body, which otherwise has none. Its Speeches, Bowings, Kneelings, Prostrations, or other Postures, are applicable to various, sometimes very wicked, Purposes, and have no real Concern in Religion, till the Soul becomes religious, and makes a proper Application of them. Our Adversaries then, in calling a meer external Act, as *Water-baptism* is, a Means of Admission into Christianity, seem to make the *Body* the Seat of Religion instead of the Soul: But alas, they strive against the Stream of true Religion, which runs the contrary Way. The *Spirit of God* is the *Source, Spring and Fountain* of Life and Salvation, from which issueth that *River*, mentioned by the *Psalmist*, the *Streams whereof make glad the City of God*, Psal. xlv. 4. The Christian Baptism is a spiritual Washing in those Streams

Streams, which cleanse out first that which is *within the Cup and Platter*, the Corruptions and Defilements of the Heart; and thence flow farther to the washing of the Body, that *the Outside may be clean also*: By this the Souls of the Faithful experience their *Hearts sprinkled from an evil Conscience*, and their *Bodies washed with pure Water*, Heb. x. 22. These Streams, first wash the Soul, and then the Body. The Soul being first cleansed from Sin, and having its Inclinations and Desires turned from Earthly, and set upon Heavenly Things, the Members also of the Body become subservient to the Purposes of *Righteousness and Holiness*, Rom. vi. 19. And thus, not only the *Souls*, but the *Bodies* of the Saints, are presented a *living Sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is their reasonable Service*, Rom. xii. 1. And they become enabled to *glorify God in their Bodies and in their Spirit, which are God's*, 1 Cor. vi. 20. This, as the Scriptures abundantly shew, is the Course of the Current of the River of Life, which cannot be turn'd or alter'd by Men's Inventions. The *Sanctification* of the Church is ascribed to this WATER, *Ephes. v. 26.* where Christ is said to *sanctify and cleanse it with the Washing of Water by the Word*. The same Work of *Sanctification* is ascribed to the SPIRIT, 1 *Pet. i. 2.* 'Tis also ascribed to the BLOOD of Christ, *Rev. i. 5. who washed us from our Sins in his own Blood.* Which *Oneness* of Effect on the Souls of Men, plainly shews, that in the Scripture Phrase, those Terms *Water, Spirit, Blood*, when applied to an inward Cleansing from Sin, are *synonimous*, and of the same spiritual Import, according to that Saying of the beloved Disciple, 1 *John v. 8. There are three that bear Witness in Earth, the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, and these three ἐκ τῶ ἑνὸς, are to one, or the same, thing.* This is the true *Christian Baptism*, to which the holy Scripture ascribes those blessed Effects of being *sanctified and cleansed, being saved, putting on Christ, having our Sins forgiven, &c.* All which purifying Work of the Holy Spirit, the *Vindicator*, from a dangerous Mistake of the Sense of holy Scripture, and gross Apprehensions

of the Nature and Foundation of the Christian Church, applies to an *external* Act of washing with *Elementary Water*, and is himself really guilty of what, p. 40, he falsely charges the *Replier* with, viz. ‘perplexing the Cause in hand with Impertinence and Chicanerie, and endeavouring to draw Parallels where there is no Equality of Comparison.’

He next comes to treat of Christ’s baptizing with Water; the Text *John* iv. 2. is positive, that *Jesus himself baptized not*; but the *Vindicator* has asserted that *it is probable he baptized himself*. A direct Contradiction to the Text; in which, till he shall honestly acknowledge it, we must leave him; and proceed, to the Practice of Christ’s Disciples both before and after his Ascension, which he urges as a *strong Argument* for Water-baptism; though, as I shew’d him in my *Reply*, p. 25. of which he takes no Notice, himself will not admit the Force of it in a Case exactly parallel.

That the first *Jewish* Converts did continue in the Practice of the Rites of that Religion after Christ’s Ascension, he denies not, but owns, p. 49, that the ‘Multitude of the believing *Jews* did continue *zealous of the Law*.’ Yet, says he, ‘the more wise and moderate among them were not so very tenacious of their Rites as to incorporate all of them with Christianity, but that they might, and did, after a more mature Consideration, and a fuller Conviction, leave them entirely off.’ Which is the very Case, as we apprehend, concerning *Water-baptism*, which though they might practise for a Time, was not to be incorporated into Christianity, but upon a maturer Consideration and fuller Conviction, to be left off. And accordingly we find the Apostle *Paul*, after he had for some Time practised that Rite, gives this substantial Reason for his leaving it off, viz. *Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel*. Which Declaration plainly shews the Reverse of what the *Vindicator*, p. 50, insists on, and proves that the Apostles Practice, in administering Water-baptism, was not to be followed, seeing that he, who was not behind the

Chief

Chief of the Apostles, being under an infallible Conduct, has given so substantial a Reason for its Cessation.

In his following Paragraphs, p. 50, 51, 52, he exerts himself, and talks in the exalted Stile of the *Pharisees* of old, and endeavours to run down Tradesmen and Mechanicks, like them who said, *This People who know not the Law are cursed.* His Discourse here discovers more *Heat* than *Reason*; when he is cool 'twill need no Answer. But he has dropt a very unguarded Expression, p. 51. concerning *Christ's Religion*, that 'indeed it 'would have been *Herefy*, unless it had been proved 'true by Signs and Wonders.' I shall take no Advantage of what I think he has inadvertently let fall, only desire him, at his Leisure, either to retract or explain it. His unmannerly, because unseasonable, Flirt at the *Quakers*, about denying the Resurrection of the *Body*, deserves no Notice; I can assure him, they believe in that Point just as they think the Apostle *Paul* did.

In p. 28, 29, of my *Reply*, I granted the Truth of his own Words, viz. 'That though we are to worship God 'in *Spirit*, yet it is not exclusive of *bodily Service*; and 'as God is the Maker of our Bodies as well as our Souls, 'so he is to have the Worship and Honour of both.' This he insinuates, *Vind.* p. 52, to be a granting of all that he contended for: Whereas I have shew'd him the very contrary, and that the Words *bodily Service* were by him misinterpreted, and used in a Sense quite foreign to that of the Texts he quoted. If the Reader will be pleased to turn to the Pages of my *Reply* last refer'd to, he will see whether the *Vindicator* has not tacitly given up one main Point in the present Controversy.

In his *Vindication*, p. 53, he pretends to free himself of a Contradiction charged, by explaining his Assertion, 'That there was a Baptism with Water practised by our 'Saviour's Disciples without the Spirit.' But how does he explain it? By telling us, that 'the ordinary Gifts 'of the Spirit were conveyed in Baptism, but the Extraordinary by Imposition of Hands.' But how the ordinary Gifts of the Spirit can be communicated without the Spirit, is still left unexplained. The

The next Thing he objects to, p. 53, is my saying, that ‘ *Circumcision* and *Water-baptism* were equally Rites ‘ of Initiation into the *Jewish* Church ; what therefore ‘ the Apostle said of the One of them, is alike applica- ‘ ble to the Other.’ And then goes on to shew that ‘ they were not of equal Antiquity,’ nor the One ‘ in- ‘ separably attendant to the Other.’ Which I never said they were. Thus is he pleased to busy himself : But after all, in p. 55, he acknowledges that ‘ Outward ‘ Baptism of Water is of no real Benefit without the in- ‘ ward Baptism with the Spirit.’ In which he says well, but mistakes in asserting, that ‘ if we would have the in- ‘ ternal Baptism, we must have the External likewise.’ For certainly the Sign and the Substance are not of equal Necessity. He again cites *Colos. ii. 11.* and says, p. 56, that ‘ by the Circumcision made without Hands, Bap- ‘ tism is plainly meant,’ but should have considered, that *Water-baptism* is *made with Hands*, and therefore cannot be there meant. The Baptism there meant, is the real *putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh*, which Water-baptism is not.

S E C T. IV.

Of the Baptism of the Eunuch and Cornelius.

THE *Vindicator*, who in his former *Defence*, had considered the Eunuch either as a meer *Gentile*, or a *Profelyte* of the Covenant ; now tells us, p. 61, that ‘ there is the greatest reason to believe that he was either ‘ a *Profelyte* of the Covenant, or a natural *Jew*,’ but has not refuted the Opinion of *Godwyn*, who ranks him among the *Profelytes of the Gate*. It appears, from the Variety of Opinions adduced concerning him, that ’tis uncertain what he was : We shall therefore wave any farther Conjectures on that Head, and only consider what

what else the *Vindicator* has advanced : He says, p. 64, ' All this great *Apparatus* to the baptizing of the Eunuch would not have been shewn, if there had not been something more in it than the washing this Person at his meer Request.' The Text is so far from mentioning *any great Apparatus* in the Case, that it relates the Matter of Baptizing as an accidental Circumstance adapted to a Notion the Eunuch had preconceived of the Use of such a Ceremony. The Answer which *Philip* gave him seems to be by way of Condescension, *thou may'st* ; not in the *Vindicator's* Stile of Necessity, *thou must*. Nor does it appear by the Text that '*Philip* was sent to baptize the Eunuch' with Water, but to *open the Scripture* to him, and to *preach unto him Jesus*. The Matter of his Water-baptism is related as an Incident happening *as they went on their Way*, a Thing not enjoind by *Philip*, but comply'd with.

As to what the *Vindicator* says, that '*St. Paul*, tho' sent extraordinarily by God to be an Apostle to the *Gentiles*, needed first to be baptized before he entred on the Office,' *Acts* ix. 15—18. That Text is not necessarily to be understood of Water-baptism, for in Verse 17, *Ananias* declares, that he was sent to *Paul*, that *he might receive his Sight, and be filled with the holy Ghost*. The Words, *be baptized*, in this Place, are interpreted by the Apostle himself by this Phrase, *Wash away thy Sins*, *Acts* xxii. 16. which not being predicable of Water-baptism, plainly shews, that it is not the Baptism here intended.

The *Vindicator* comes, p. 65, to the Case of *Peter* and *Cornelius*, and spends two or three Pages in repeating the Substance of what he had before argued in his Defence, concluding, p. 68, as he had done before, that the Water-baptism administred to *Cornelius* 'was not a *Jewish*, but a Christian Baptism.' He acknowledges that 'he has passed over some (I think many) things relating to *Cornelius* mentioned in the Reply,' because, as I think, he despair'd of Success in meddling with them: The Reader may again peruse them in p. 36, 37, 38, of

my *Reply*. I shall content my self with repeating but one of them, as it is in p. 47, ‘ Those Converts, to wit, Cornelius and his Company, had already received the Christian Baptism, viz. *the Gift of the holy Ghost*: And therefore to call the Water-baptism afterward administred, Christian Baptism, is to make two Christian Baptisms in force at one Time, contrary to the Words of the Apostle, Ephes. iv. 5. *One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism.*’ This, and some other Things there, it was easier to pass over than to answer.

The next Point he is pleased to object to, are these Expressions of mine, viz. ‘ The saving Faith of Jesus Christ properly denominates a Man a Christian.’ And ‘ A Man may be baptized with Water without being made a Christian, and he may be made a Christian without being baptized with Water.’ In answer to this he queries thus, ‘ I would ask the *Replier* where he reads, that Faith without Baptism makes a perfect Christian?’ To which I answer, What I asserted was not concerning *Faith without Baptism*, but concerning *Faith without Water-baptism*: But ’tis his Method to puzzle Things by a confused Use of Terms of a very different Signification. I must therefore distinguish what he confounds, and tell him, that though I do not think Water-baptism necessary to Salvation, yet I do believe *Baptism* is necessary to that End. By *Baptism*, I understand the *washing away of Sin*, the *cleansing of the Soul*, the *purifying of the Heart*, which is expressly ascribed to *Faith*, Acts xv. 9. For which reason I used the Term *saving Faith*, by which I understand *baptizing*, or *purifying Faith*: That Faith to which the holy Scriptures attribute *Life and Salvation*. Heb. x. 38. *The Just shall live by Faith.* Verse 39, *We are of them that believe to the saving of the Soul.* Acts xvi. 31, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.* 1 Pet. i. 5. *Who are kept by the Power of God through Faith unto Salvation.* Verse 9. *Receiving the End of your Faith, even the Salvation of your Souls.* This *saving Faith* which includes the *Christian Baptism* or *real Cleansing from Sin*, is that which I say, properly denominates

nates a Man a Christian, and which may make him so without being baptized with Water.

To this clear Light of holy Scripture he opposes his own Suppositions and Misapprehensions of some Texts, ' I think, *says he*, p. 69, the contrary will manifestly appear in such Instances as I shall produce, where *Baptism* (he means Water-baptism) did follow upon the Profession of such a Faith, and which if it had not been *ordinarily* necessary to make a Man a Christian, we cannot suppose it would have been so constantly practised.' The Texts he produces in favour of his Opinion are, Acts viii. 12, 13, *When the Samaritans believed Philip's preaching the Things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both Men and Women. Then Simon himself believed also and was baptized.* Vers. 37, 38. Where after the Eunuch had professed that *Jesus Christ was the Son of God, — they went both down into the Water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.* Acts xvi. 31—33, *And they, Paul and Silas, said to the Jailor, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy House. And they spake unto him the Word of the Lord, and to all that were in his House, and he took them the same Hour of the Night and washed their Stripes, and was baptized he and all his straightway.* Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* The Text relating to Philip and the Eunuch we have before considered, and shewn that Philip did not enjoin Water-baptism as a Duty upon the Eunuch; but permitted it in Condescension to his Desire. In that concerning Paul and Silas, and the Jailor, 'tis plain, they lay the whole Stress of the *Salvation* of him and his House upon *believing in the Lord Jesus Christ*, without saying a Word of Water-baptism: And that the Jailor and his House were baptized with Water, is not certain from the Text. That of Acts viii. 12, 13, we admit to be spoken of Water-baptism: But that of Mark xvi. 16. is spoken of the *Baptism of the holy Ghost*, the real Christian Baptism, or spiritual Cleansing from Sin. To prove this, let it be consider'd the Text is very

F

express

expres, that *Simon the Sorcerer believed and was baptized*, but notwithstanding that, *Peter* pronounces him to be *in the Gall of Bitterness, and in the Bond of Iniquity*, Verse 23. and consequently not saved. Whence it follows, that the Baptism *Simon* was baptized with, *to wit*, Water-baptism, was not the Baptism spoken of in *Mark* xvi. 16, of which 'tis indefinitely said, and without Exception, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*. Wherefore the Baptism there mentioned, must be that of the Holy Ghost, viz. *the purifying of the Heart thro' Faith*. In which Sense the Import of the Text is, *He that believeth and is sanctified, shall be saved*; wherein two Things necessary to Salvation, viz. *Faith* and *Holiness*, which the holy Scripture separately speaks of as Causes *sine quâ non*, *Heb. xi. 6. Without Faith it is impossible to please God. Heb. xii. 14. Without Holiness no Man shall see the Lord*, are conjoined, and go hand in hand in the Work of Salvation: And were both understood by me as comprehended under the Term *saving Faith*. 'Tis easy to observe, that the Manner of the Apostles, throughout their whole Writings, is to inculcate these two Branches of Duty, *Faith* and *Holiness*, as the only Things essential to Salvation; sometimes *Faith* alone is mentioned, sometimes *Holiness*: Those that with an humble and sincere Mind do exercise themselves in studying and comparing of Scripture, may see how these Points, joined together in one, make a compleat Christian; and they that do not, will be in danger of mixing with the Terms of Salvation such Things as are unnecessary, and of teaching for Doctrines the Traditions of Men.

In p. 71, he cites a Question propos'd to him in my *Reply*, and remarks upon it thus, 'Here, no doubt, the *Replier* thinks there is a notable Dilemma, which will certainly pinch hard for a Man to extricate himself out of.' To which I shall only say, that, no doubt, the *Vindicator* thinks so too, and for that Reason does not answer it. However, since he proposes me a Question, I shall not follow his Example in evading an Answer:
He

He queries, ' If the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit ' made *Cornelius* a Christian, how came he afterwards ' to be baptized?' I answer, that I think it was done in Condescension to those Brethren of the Circumcision who were present ; and not by Virtue of a Commission from Christ: And my Reason for so thinking, is *Peter's* proposing to them this Question, *Can any Man forbid Water?* For if Christ had commanded their being baptized with Water, 'tis not reasonable to suppose the Apostle would have proposed it as a Matter subject to the Prohibition of Man.

His next Remark is p. 72, that in granting the Word *Go*, in Mat. xxviii. 19, to be expressed by a Participle in *Greek*, ' I have yielded up a Point which I would have ' made great Use of in this Dispute.' But how he knows that, I can't tell. I think the Word is equally against him, whether it be render'd *Going* or *Go* ; either of them shews that the Commission was given to those who were to *go forth*, not to *stay at home* ; and the Message they were sent on imports as *much*. Either of them is a plain Indication that the *Vindicator* and his Brethren, who *go not forth*, have no Part in this Commission, or else that they are extremely negligent in the Performance of it.

I had said in my *Reply*, that ' if both *Baptizing* and ' *Teaching* must go to *making Disciples* ; Subjects incapable of being taught cannot come under that Designation.' Here he busies himself in making, I think, an unnecessary Distinction between a *natural* and *permanent Incapacity*, and a *present Incapacity*: Be it which it will, my Remark was equally just, *during such Incapacity*, which was all I insisted on. So that what he, p. 74, calls my ' favourite Expression of Subjects *altogether incapable*,' has but one Sense, ' true in Fact,' and directly ' against him in this Debate.'

Upon my saying, *Reply* p. 41, that ' his (*Peter's*) ' Commission was *to teach*, in the faithful Discharge ' whereof, he was favour'd with the Power and Efficacy ' of the holy Spirit accompanying him according to the

‘ Promise of Christ, *Lo, I am with you always to the End of the World.*’ The *Vindicator*, p. 74, 75, thus expresses himself,

‘ I doubt we cannot interpret this Promise of Christ’s Presence with the Teachers of his Gospel to the World’s End, otherwise than of some standing Benefit or lasting Privilege to be claimed by the Christian Church in all Ages ; and therefore we must not understand it of the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, bestow’d only in the first Ages, nor apply it to the Case of *Cornelius* abovementioned : For if these be allowed, will it not follow, that the same kind of Baptism with the Holy Ghost, (*viz.* such a Pouring forth of the Spirit as enabled the Recipients to speak with Tongues) must by Virtue of this Promise be bestowed in all Ages, wherever the Gospel should be faithfully preached and received ?’ To which I answer, that it doth not so follow ; the particular and extraordinary Pourings forth of the Spirit, do not exclude the general and ordinary ones. Though we doubt not but that those who in the primitive Times were enabled to speak with Tongues and work Miracles were baptized with the holy Ghost, yet we do not think the Baptism of the holy Ghost confined to them only, but extended to all the Faithful, even all those whom God hath *chosen to Salvation through Sanctification of the Spirit, and Belief of the Truth.* 1 Tim. ii. 13.

We do not understand the promised Presence of Christ with his Ministers to relate ‘ to miraculous Gifts only, nor yet to the ordinary Graces of the Spirit only,’ but to all such Gifts of the Spirit as he is pleas’d to qualify them with, *for the Perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the Edifying of the Body of Christ,* Eph. iv. 12. ’Tis a standing Promise through all Ages ; Christ is ever present with his faithful Servants, to enable them to the Work whereunto he calls them ; *dividing to every Man severally as he will,* 1 Cor. xii. 11. His Power is always the same, and as able to work Miracles now as ever : Nor are there any declared Limits of Time in holy Writ,
for

for the exerting that Power : Those therefore who assert, that Miracles are ceased, presume to be wise above what is written, and to teach others, what the holy Scriptures never taught them.

In p. 42. of my *Reply*, I charged him with two Mistakes, One was, his asserting, that ‘by all the Circumstances of the History, *Peter* appeared surpriz’d at that which had happen’d,’ he now owns, ’tis not expressly said so, but refers himself to the Reader’s Judgment, to which I also willingly submit.

His other Mistake was, in calling ‘the Baptism of the Holy Ghost and that of our Lord’s Commission to baptize all Nations, two different Sorts of Baptism.’ To this he now says, *Vind.* p. 76. ‘As the *Replier* himself allows *John’s Water-baptism* to be of a different Sort from that of the Spirit, why may not I say the same of Christ’s *Water-baptism*?’ This Query is easily answer’d, by observing that *Christ’s Baptism* was not *Water-baptism*, but is expressly distinguished from it by *John* the Baptist, *I indeed, says he, have baptized with Water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost*, Mark i. 8. Upon which Texts, as I did before in my *Reply*, p. 48, so I now again query, If *Baptism with Water*, and *Baptism with the Holy Ghost*, had not been two Baptisms, with what Propriety could he have so distinguished them? Or, if Christ’s Baptism had been also with Water, how could the *Baptist* have so appropriated that to himself? The *Vindicator*, as I apprehend, has not answer’d these Queries: He has indeed attempted them in *Vind.* p. 89, 90, but in such a Manner as proves nothing, unless it be the Distress he is in, who is oblig’d to lay the Weight of his Cause on the most slender Suppositions, such as are directly contrary to the Nature of the Gospel Dispensation, viz. That our Saviour came, instead of abolishing, but to commute carnal Ordinances; and instead of putting an End to Ceremonies, to exalt them to an higher Perfection. Suppositions, however antiscriptural, not to be wondred at in him, who holds the *Christian Church to be no other than*

than a Superstructure on the Jewish. See Vind. pag. 38.

I took Notice in my *Reply*, p. 43, of a Difference between Dr. *Samuel Clark* and the Author of the *Defence*, concerning Water-baptism; one making it *antecedent*, the other *subsequent* to the Gifts of the holy Spirit; which the *Vindicator* attempts to reconcile, by pretending, p. 79, that it had Relation only to ‘an Antecedency and ‘Subsequency of extraordinary Gifts,’ though the Passage cited from the *Doctor* expressly speaks of ‘the Gifts ‘of the holy Ghost, whether they were extraordinary ‘or ordinary.’

He seems offended, p. 79, at my saying, that ‘the ‘purifying and sanctifying Gifts of the holy Spirit, which ‘are of a Nature purely spiritual, have in reality no Relation to Water-baptism, a Ceremony meerly external ‘and carnal; and that the Manner of communicating ‘internal Sanctity by such a meer external Application, ‘is every way unintelligible and inexplicable.’ As to the former Part of this, the *Vindicator* seems to acknowledge, that ‘there is no real, physical, Relation, between Spirit and Water,’ but says, ‘an Action performed with Water may have a real, though it be a ‘moral Relation, by Appointment, to an Operation ‘of the holy Spirit.’ Supposing this possible, yet must such *Appointment* be very *express, plain, and evident*; which he hath not yet shewn that of Water-baptism to be. The latter Part he says he agrees with, but adds, ‘What is this to the Purpose, if *Sanctity* be notwithstanding communicated by means of external Application, there must be some kind of Relation between ‘the Means and the Effect, though we cannot define it.’ And again, ‘As to the Manner how it is communicated, since we are sure of the Effect, it matters not.’ But if there be no Sanctity communicated, if the Effect be not visible nor demonstrable, which, notwithstanding what he has said, may be, and we think is, the very Truth of the Case; how will he then prove the Relation supposed, seeing no wise Man will accept his saying, *we are sure of it, for a Reason?*

He

He endeavours then to draw a Parallel between *Teaching* and *baptizing with Water*, and tells us, that ‘*Teaching* is no more than an external Application, and yet, that internal Sanctity may be conveyed by preaching the Word.’ He should have consider’d, that *the Teaching which is no more than an external Application*, is a different Thing from *preaching the Word*. The preaching of the Gospel was *more than an external Application*, it was *in Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power*. 1 Cor. ii. 4. *Our Gospel came not unto you, as a meer external Application, in Word only, but, also in Power and in the holy Ghost*. This Notion of the *Vindicator’s*, that *preaching the Gospel is no more than an external Application*, may be of dangerous Consequence, by encouraging dead and lifeless Preachers to content themselves only with an external and formal Application of the Words of Christ and his Apostles, without that Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power, which attends the true Ministers of the Gospel, and strikes home upon the Consciences of the Hearers by an internal and effectual Application of it.

I observed in my *first Answer* to him, that ‘the Word *baptizeth*, John i. 33, is used in the present Tense,’ Upon which he remarks in his *Defence*, ‘That the present Tense is often used for the Future, which is to follow soon, as *ερχεται*, which is of the present Tense, is used for the *Messiah* to come.’ To which I replied, ‘that the *Messiah* was then come, and personally present.’ To which he now answers, *Vind.* p. 81, ‘Tho’ the *Messiah* was already come, yet the Person using the Word did not know it:’ Which shews that the Case is not parallel, for *John* the Baptist did know that Christ was come and baptized; and said unto him, *I have need to be baptized of thee*; which Expression seems evidently to import a *Baptism which Christ did then baptize with*, agreeable to the plain Sense of the Word *baptizeth*, John i. 33.

‘I cannot (says the *Vindicator*, p. 82, 83,) but remark, that if our Saviour baptized with the holy
‘ Ghost

‘ Ghost in his Life-time, and this Text (*John* vii. 39.
 ‘ *that the holy Ghost was not given, because Jesus was not*
 ‘ *yet glorified*) has Reference to the great Effusion of the
 ‘ Spirit after Christ’s Ascension, they will contradict
 ‘ one another ; for the one of them says, that there was
 ‘ no giving of the Spirit in such Abundance (which is
 ‘ the same with not being baptized with the Spirit, *Acts*
 ‘ ii.) till Christ was glorified ; and the other says, that
 ‘ Christ did baptize with the Spirit in his Life-time ;
 ‘ now how the *Replier* will reconcile these I cannot ap-
 ‘ prehend.’ I think them easily reconcilable : Does not
 the *Vindicator* himself acknowledge, p. 82, that ‘ the
 ‘ holy Ghost might in some measure be given in our
 ‘ Saviour’s Life-time?’ It certainly was so, and accord-
 ingly the Text, *John* i. 33, speaking of Christ in his
 Life-time, saith, *The same is he which baptizeth with the*
holy Ghost. So that the Giving, Effusion, or Pouring
 forth of the Spirit in a lesser measure, is called Baptism
 with the holy Ghost, as well as the giving forth of the
 Spirit in greater Abundance is so called : From whence
 we may justly infer, that as the Degree of a Thing alters
 not the Nature of it, the Baptism of the holy Ghost, tho’
 ascribed, *Acts* i. 5. to that abundant Pouring forth of
 the Spirit on the Apostles, and those assembled with
 them, on the Day of *Pentecost*, was not limited to that
 particular Effusion thereof, but is also applicable to the
 general Effusion of the same Spirit, which, under the
 Gospel Dispensation is promised, *shall be poured out upon*
all Flesh.

He calls upon me, p. 83, to prove that *Crispus* and
Gaius were circumcised, as well as baptized with Water
 by *Paul* : A Point not to be determined on either Side,
 because the Text is silent therein.

In p. 84, the *Vindicator* says, ‘ That the primitive
 ‘ Church had the same Ecclesiastical Officers that we
 ‘ have now, viz. *Bishops, Presbyters* or *Elders*, and
 ‘ *Deacons.*’ But he may know, that those Words, as
 used in the holy Scriptures, do not necessarily infer so
 many distinct Offices : The Words *Bishop* and *Elder*,

as there used, seem frequently to denote one and the same Person: The Apostle *Peter* exhorting the *Πρεσβυτέραι*, calls them in the next Verse *Επισκοπῶντες*, 1 *Pet.* v. 1, 2. The Apostle *Paul* calls himself a *Deacon*, 1 *Cor.* iii. 5. They are placed in such a State of Equality, that it cannot be discovered from holy Writ which of them is entitled to the Supremacy or Lordship. Which may suffice to shew that those Words did not mean *then* just what they are commonly used for *now*. I shall not enlarge on this Subject; nor has the *Vindicator* any reason to desire me to do it. Let him not interpret my Silence to be Insensibility; for I know the Advantages I could take on this Occasion.

I think the *Vindicator* abuses some of my Friends, when he says, they 'have abused the Text *Mat.* viii. 15. and 'made a Church-Deacon of *Peter's* Wife's Mother.' I don't believe any of them produc'd that Text for that Intent: Nor need they, having another Text which expressly attributes that Office to a Woman, viz. *Rom.* xvi. 1. *I commend unto you Phebe our Sister, ἡμεῖς αὐτὴν διακόνον, τῆς ἐκκλησίας, being a Deacon of the Church*, or, which I think is all one, a *Church-Deacon*.

The *Vindicator*, p. 86, to shew that the Words, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the holy Ghost*, *Mat.* xxviii. 19. were intended for a *Form of Words to be used in Baptism*, endeavours, with Dr. *Clark's* Assistance, to prove the Injunction of that *Form of Words* from the Use of another. But how do they prove it? By roundly asserting, that 'it was well known by all Christians.' But how came they to know the Sentiments of *all Christians* in this Affair, at such a Distance of Time as the Days of the Apostles? Have those early Christians left any Testimonials in Writing concerning their Knowledge herein? Or were the Thoughts of those Christians communicated to these Men by Revelation? If neither of these, then their Assertion proves nothing but their own Presumption, in taking upon them to be wise *above what is written*; and adventuring to assert what 'tis impossible for them to know.

The *Vindicator* still affirms, p. 87, that 'it is plain
' from *John* iii. 22—26. that our Saviour did baptize,'
(viz. with Water,) which requires no other Answer, than
that 'tis *more plain* from *John* iv. 2. that our Saviour did
not baptize.

He tells us, p. 88, that there is an Ambiguity in the
Term *Christ's Baptism*, and says, 'there are two Bap-
'tisms attributed to Christ, viz. Baptism with Water,
'and Baptism with the Spirit.' His Mistake in attri-
buting Water-baptism to Christ is manifest from the
Text last cited, which expressly declares, that *Jesus him-
self baptized not*. Seeing then Christ *did not baptize with
Water*, 'tis plain that only the *Baptism with the Spirit* is
attributed to him; and by Consequence, that the Bap-
tism mentioned *Eph.* iv. 5. is no other than that of the
Spirit. And that the *Vindicator's* Attempt, p. 89, 90,
to confound what the Scripture plainly distinguishes,
is vain and frivolous.

He cites, p. 91, the following Passage from the *Re-
ply*, viz. 'The Apostle *Peter* evidently shews, that the
'*Baptism which now saves* is not one with Water-bap-
'tism, when *1 Pet.* iii. 21, he calls the *Baptism which
'saves* *Antitype* to Water, whereby *Noah*
'and his Family were saved in the Ark. He doth not
'say as our Translators have render'd it, *the like Figure*
'*whereunto*, but the *Antitype* thereto, or Thing figured
'thereby: Water then was but the Type or Figure,
'but the Apostle attributes Salvation to the *Antitype*,
'telling us that 'tis *not* the putting away the Filth of the
'Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience: Now Water-
'Baptism cannot give the Answer of a good Conscience;
'tis the Baptism of the Spirit, for 'tis *the Spirit that
'beareth Witness, for the Spirit is Truth*, *1 John* iii. 6.'

To this the *Vindicator* answers, p. 91, 'That the
'Words *not* and *but*, do in Scripture frequently signify
'*not only*, and likewise, but *also* and *principally*, and so
'the *not* and *but* construed in this manner will be some
'Help to the clearing of it.' I think rather to the ob-
scuring of it, because neither the Text nor Context
require

require any such Construction, as in the other Passages he cites they plainly do. That of *Mark ix. 37.* is fully explained by the preceding Words, *Whoso shall receive me;* and that of *Gen. xlv. 8.* is secur'd from Possibility of Mistake, by the Subject matter treated of, and the Persons spoken to. But the Text under Consideration is not attended with any of those Circumstances, and therefore such a Construction thereof would be unnatural and forced. And such a Liberty of Interpretation would open a Door to much Perversion of Scripture; for Instance, by this Method the Text, *Mat. xviii. 40:* Not *this Man*, but *Barabbas*, would be made to signify that the *Jews* had asked the Release of both of them. *Acts x. 41.* Not *unto all the People*, but *unto Witnesses chosen before of God*, would be perverted to a Falsity in Fact. By this, that of *Rom. ii. 13.* For not *the Hearers of the Law are just before God*, but *the Doers of the Law shall be justified*, would be made to import, that the bare Hearing of the Law were the Cause of Justification. A Multitude of Instances might be given of the ill Consequences of such a Liberty: And therefore the *Vindicator* ought not to be indulged therein, nor admitted, by such a dangerous Method of perverting the Text, to ascribe to *Water-baptism* such Effects as it cannot produce; for the *Answer of a good Conscience* is not the Effect of *outward washing with Water*, but of the secret Operation of the Spirit of God upon the Soul, which *Water-baptism* cannot produce.

The next Thing he undertakes is, p. 92, to consider the Word *Ἀντίτυπον Antitype*. 'The *Replier*, says he, 'if I understand him aright, would make this Word 'signify something contrary to the Type; and so Water 'being the Type, the Answer of a good Conscience 'must be the Antitype, and consequently Baptism must 'consist in it.' In this he either mistakes or perverts my Meaning; for I would not make the Word *Antitype* signify something *contrary* to the Type, but something answerable or parallel to the Type or Figure: That the Word *Ἀντίτυπον Antitype* properly signifies that which

answers to the Type or Figure, I presume the *Vindicator's* profound Knowledge in the *Greek Tongue* will not deny ; and that, in a proper Sense, the Antitype, or Thing figur'd, is not the same Thing with the Type or Figure : Now, in the Text under Consideration, the Parallel lies between the Type or Figure, viz. *the Water* by which *Noah* and his Family were saved in the Ark, and the Antitype or Thing figured, viz. *the Baptism which now saves* ; and what is that ? Not the Type *Water-baptism* which is not saving ; but the Antitype the *spiritual Baptism*, or Answer of a good Conscience toward God by the Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, which saveth. Salvation is annexed not to the Figure, but to the thing figured. As the Bodies of *Noah* and his Family were saved by *Water*, so the Souls of the Faithful are now saved by the *Spirit* which giveth Life, 2 Cor. iii. 6. But the learned *Vindicator* informs us from *Suidas*, that there is another Sense of the Words, and that ἀντίτυπον λαμβάνεται καὶ ἐπὶ ὁμοιότητι, the Antitype is taken from Likeness. And what then ; since that Likeness is taken from the Type, the Distinction between Type and Antitype is still evident ; even as the *Printer's Letter* is the Type, but the Impression is the Antitype. But as this Signification of the Word is not applicable to the Text here treated of, I presume the *Vindicator* adduced it, for the Demonstration of his Learning, not for its Pertinency to the Point in hand. That the Word ἀντίτυπον may sometime be used in the same Sense with τύπος, and that it seems to be so used *Heb. ix. 24*, I shall not dispute : But I still insist, that the proper Sense of the Word is otherwise : And that in this Text, 1 *Pet. iii. 21*, 'tis to be taken in its proper Sense, for a Reason which the *Vindicator* himself has produced out of *Leigh's Critica Sacra*, upon the Place, viz. ' *Hoc autem loco significat ipsam veritatem, similitudine seu Analogiâ quâdam typo ac figuræ respondentem.* In this Text it signifies the Truth it self, by a certain Similitude or Likeness answering to the Type or Figure.' The *Vindicator* misrepresents the Matter when he charges me, p. 93, with attributing

attributing Dissimilitude or Contrariety to the *Antitype*: Whereas I am for keeping up a Resemblance between the Type and Antitype, though not an Identity. 'Tis the Manner of holy Scripture to exhibit *spiritual Things* by their Similitude or Resemblance to *natural Things*: Nevertheless they each of them still retain their proper Natures. The Scripture doth not treat of them as one and the same; *Circumcision of the Flesh*, and *Circumcision of the Heart*, are there mentioned as two Things, not as *one and the same*: *Outward washing*, and *inward Cleansing*, are understood as two Things, not *one and the same*. But the *Vindicator*, to maintain the Necessity of the Sign or Figure, makes no Distinction betwixt the Sign and Thing signified, the Figure and the Thing represented by it, the Shadow and the Substance: A Confusion not only antiscritptural, but as irrational, as it would be to affirm, that the Picture of a Man is a real Part of him; and that the *Man* consists of himself and his Image. This, I acknowledge, I did call *profound Nonsense*; an Expression the *Vindicator* is much offended at, and which I now desire him to excuse; for I think the Word *profound* was by me improperly applied, and that the *Nonsense* is so *shallow* that it may be easily seen through.

But the *Vindicator* tells me, p. 94, that 'all the Nonsense is owing to my Inattention or Misunderstanding 'what a Sacrament is.' I think 'tis rather owing to his Inattention to the Definition which his own Church in her Catechism gives of it, viz. that *It is an outward and visible Sign of an inward and spiritual Grace*. Where the Sign and the Thing signified are plainly distinguished. A due Observance of which Distinction might have kept him from *darkning Counsel by Words without Knowledge*. However, since he charges me with 'misunderstanding 'what a Sacrament is,' I shall give him the Opinion of one that did understand what it was. 'Tis a choice Passage I have met with taken out of *Curcellanus*, viz.

The

* The Word *Sacrament*, saith he, which by human
 Prudence hath been applied to the sacred Rites of
 Baptism and the Lord's Supper, is so improper, that
 I wonder what came into the *Doctors* Minds who first
 drew it thither. For 1st, it signifies any kind of Oath,
 but chiefly a military one. 2dly, Warfare. 3dly,
 A Soldier. 4thly, Money deposited with the Pontiff
 by the Plaintiff and Defendant. 5thly, The same
 with *μυστήριον* in Greek, i. e. a Secret pertaining to Reli-
 gious Rites, not to be divulged to the Prophane. But
 what have Baptism and the Lord's Supper common
 with these Things, that they should be entituled by
 the same Name? But though there were no Impropri-
 ety in the Word, yet having been the Occasion of so
 many Quarrels and Contentions among Christians, it
 deserves now to be rejected.' — He then goes on to
 specify some of the many Points of Dispute arisen from
 the Use of that Word, which, he says, '† and infinite
 more are particularly and severally with great heat
 debated among Christians.' '‡ So that, says he, the
 Word *Sacrament* was brought into the Church under
 a very unhappy Constellation, and (if what is done
 could be undone) it were to be wished that it had never
 been heard of there.'

His

* *Vox Sacramenti*, quæ prudentiâ quadam humanâ sacris Bap-
 tismi & Cœnæ dominicæ ritibus applicata fuit, tam est impropria, ut
 mirer, quid in mentem venerit Doctõribus, qui illam primùm eò
 traxerunt. Significat enim, 1. Juramentum quodvis, sed præcipuè
 militare. 2. Militiam. 3. Militem. 4. Pecuniam a partibus liti-
 gantibus apud Pontificem depositum. 5. Idem quod *μυστήριον*
 Græcis, hoc est, arcanum ad sacra pertinens, & profanis non vul-
 gandum. Sed quid Baptismus & Cœna Dominica cum his rebus com-
 mune habent ut eodem nomine insigniantur? Præterea, quamvis non
 esset inepta, tot rixis & Altercationibus inter Christianos materiam
 præbuit, ut merito nunc foret repudianda. —

† Et alia ejusmodi infinita quæ de singulis in specie magno cum
 fervore inter Christianos agitantur.

‡ Adeo ut Sacramenti Vox infausto admodum Sidere in Ecclesi-
 am sit introducta, atque (si quod factum est insectum reddi posset)
 optandum eam nunquam illic auditam fuisse. *Curcellæi* Dissert. pri-
 ma de Vocibus Trinitatis, Personæ, &c. p. 826. Sect. 32. Op. Theol.
 in folio. Amstelodami apud D. Elzevirium. 1675.

His next Observation is on the Word *ἑρπύρεμα*, which is rendred in our common Translation *the Answer*, but rather signifies *the Question or Inquiry of a good Conscience towards God*: But neither of these Senses will answer his Purpose; for whether we take the Word *ἑρπύρεμα* for *Answer* or *Inquiry*, the Matter still centers in the Work of the *Spirit* within, and not in the *Water* without.

He therefore has Recourse to another Sense of the Word, and tells us, that 'as it is a Word borrowed from the Civil Law, so it is by the Masters thereof interpreted to signify *Stipulation*, whereby between two Persons, the one *interrogating* and the other *opposing*, a Contract was wont to be made.' A Sense not applicable to that Word in this Place; for what has a Contract between two Persons, to do with the Examination or Answer of a Man's own Conscience, wherein but one Person is concerned? But the *Vindicator* is fond of this Notion, because, 'if admitted here, *he says*, it will determine Baptism to be a Contract between God and Man; God by his Minister promising the Assistance of his Spirit and Heaven hereafter; as Man to believe in God and to serve him, or, as it is in the Place I am now upon, the Sponson or Promise of a good Conscience.' Thus he attempts to pervert the Text, and to ascribe to it a Sense directly repugnant to the whole Tenour of the Gospel, by a pretended external Contract, where none is, placing the Stress of Salvation on promising instead of performing, and substituting a Profession of *Faith* and *Obedience* instead of the Things themselves: Ascribing to *Water-baptism* what the Scripture only ascribes to the *Spirit of Christ*, and placing Christianity in an external Ceremony, which the Scripture tells us consists in *worshipping God in Spirit and in Truth*. The *Vindicator's* Discourse, p. 96, 97, concerning an outward Covenant, and visible and sensible Marks and Tokens to designate the Persons that enter into it, savours more of the *Jew* than the *Christian*; and that the Reader may clearly see the Contrariety of his Arguing to the Nature of the Gospel Covenant, I shall transcribe the Description of it

it from the Prophet *Jeremiah*, viz. *Behold, the Days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new Covenant with the House of Israel, and with the House of Judah. Not according to the Covenant that I made with their Fathers in the Day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the Land of Egypt, (which my Covenant they brake, although I was an Husband unto them) saith the Lord. But this shall be the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel. After those Days, saith the Lord, I will put my Law in their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts, and will be their God, and they shall be my People. And they shall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, saying, know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord, for I will forgive their Iniquities, and I will remember their Sins no more.* Hence 'tis evident, that the Gospel Covenant is not outward like that of the *Jews*, and consequently, needs no external, visible, or sensible Mark in the Flesh, like that of *Circumcision*, to distinguish Men by. 'Tis a Covenant of Forgiveness of Sins, and of cleansing from them; and the outward or visible Mark of being entred into it, is that of a godly Conversation before Men, having our *Fruit unto Holiness, and the End everlasting Life*, Rom. vi. 22. But seeing the *Vindicator* insists so much on visible and sensible Marks: Let me ask him, What visible and sensible Mark does *Water-baptism* impress? Has a Man baptized with Water any visible or sensible Mark to distinguish him from a Man who is not so baptized? If not, there is no more Parity in this Case 'twixt that and *Circumcision*, than there is between the New Covenant and the Old. The old Covenant did exhibit the *Example and Shadow of heavenly Things*; the new Covenant exhibits the heavenly Things themselves: The old Covenant had *Circumcision* and *Water-baptism*, Examples and Shadows of that real Gospel Holiness which was to be perfected under the New. And as a Man, born in a Jewish Country, would not have been a Jew outwardly, without outward *Circumcision*; so a Man, born in a Christian

Christian Country, cannot be a true and real Christian without inward and spiritual Regeneration, viz. *a Death unto Sin, and a new Birth unto Righteousness*: For as we are not *naturally Men* without a natural Birth, so neither are we *Christian Men*, in a proper and Gospel-sense, without a spiritual Birth, i.e. without *inward and real Holiness* wrought in us by the Spirit of Christ; which alone can make Men true Christians, and enable them to bring forth such Fruits of Righteousness as may declare them to be so.

S E C T. V.

Of Baptism with the Holy Ghost.

IN my *Reply*, p. 50, I said, that ‘the Terms *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary*, as applied to the Gifts of ‘the Spirit, are not scriptural,’ He now retorts, saying, ‘And yet he himself makes Use of them in the ‘*Reply*,’ which is very true; but how did I use them? Not as scriptural, but in Condescension to him, who, like some others called *Divines*, chuses to make Use of them. He tells us, that ‘by the Schools the former ‘are called *gratiae gratis datae*, Gifts freely given, such ‘as the Gift of Tongues, working Miracles, &c. and ‘the latter, *gratiae gratum facientes*, Graces making ‘grateful, such as produce the Returns of a good Life, ‘in Faith, Hope, Charity, &c. and that in the Scripture they are distinguished by *χαρίσματα* and *χάριτες*, ‘the former being applied to the Extraordinary, the ‘latter to the Ordinary Gifts of the Spirit; the one ‘being commonly translated Gifts, the other Graces.’ But where does the *Vindicator* find that Word *χάριτες* in Scripture, which he says is commonly translated Graces? How often does it occur? I do not find the Word Graces in my Concordance. I know that the *χαρίσματα* and *χάρις* are

H

are distinguished in Scripture: The *χάρις* is the *Grace* or *Spirit* it self which is generally, if not always, spoken of in Scripture, in the Singular Number. The *χαρίσματα* are the Gifts of that *one Grace* or *Spirit*, and I have plainly shewn in my *Reply*, p. 50, that the Apostle in 1 Cor. xii. comprehends under that Term *χαρίσματα* the various Gifts of the same Spirit, whether *Ordinary* or *Extraordinary*. I instanced in *Wisdom, Knowledge, Faith*, which latter is a Gift so common to all Believers, that 'tis impossible for any Man to be one without it. 'Tis concerning Persons endued with any of these Gifts, even all the Members of the Body indefinitely, that the Apostle says, *By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body.* The *Vindicator* may as reasonably suppose, that the *Body* consists only of *some of its Members* exclusive of others, as that the *Gifts of the Spirit*, here mentioned, are only such as some particular Persons were endued with: Besides, that Interpretation contradicts the express Words of the Text, viz. *The Manifestation of the Spirit is given to every Man to profit withal*, Verse 7. Now if the Baptism here mentioned did relate to those extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, given only to some, how could the Apostle apply it *to all*, Verse 13, *to every Man*, Verse 7, *to all the Members of the one Body*, Verse 12? The Apostle evidently speaks of the *whole Body*, and *every Member of it*, and consequently comprehends under the Term *χαρίσματα* as well such Gifts as are ordinary and general, as those that are extraordinary and special. The *Vindicator*, instead of demonstrating the contrary from plain Scripture, attempts to overbear us with the Authority of a Trinity of *Doctors*, Dr. *Whitby*, Dr. *Hicks*, and Dr. *Bennett*, whose Opinions weigh nothing with us, when oppos'd, as in this Case, to the plain and express Declaration of the *Scriptures*. But it seems Dr. *Bennett's* Confutation of *Quakerism* is a Master-piece with the *Vindicator*, which being, as he says, * unanswer'd on this Point, he thinks, ' his poor Endeavours
' may

* In this he mistakes; for Dr. *Bennett's* Book, in this Point, was long since answer'd by Benjamin Lindley, viz. in the Year 1713.

‘ may be justly superseded.’ But does the *Vindicator* think, that because I have endeavour’d to answer him, I must answer every Body? Dr. *Bennett’s* Book was writ long before the Controversy, which the *Vindicator* has engag’d in, began; and its not being answer’d, might have been urg’d with as good reason for his not entering into this Debate at first, as ’tis now for the superseding it; but, alas, he did not then foresee the Issue.

In my *Reply*, p. 52, I had said, that the Words of *John* the Baptist concerning Christ, *Mat. ii. 11. He shall baptize you with the holy Ghost and with Fire, whose Fan is in his Hand, and he will thoroughly purge his Floor, &c.* were exactly correspondent with the Prophecy of *Malachi* concerning the Coming of the *Messiah*, *Mal. iii. 2, 3. Who may abide the Day of his Coming, and who shall stand when he appeareth, for he is like a Refiner’s Fire, and like Fullers Soap, and he shall purify the Sons of Levi, and purge them as Gold and Silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an Offering in Righteousness.* Both these Texts, I say, have Relation to the purifying Virtue of the Spirit: This the *Vindicator* endeavours to oppugn by telling us, ‘ That cloven Tongues as of Fire appear’d at the Day of Pentecost.’ Which Appearance as of Fire, he cannot but know, was not the *Baptism of the holy Ghost*, but a concomitant Circumstance at that particular Time, expressive of inward Purgation; or as the Words of Dr. *Lightfoot*, adduced by the *Vindicator* himself, are, ‘ To express the various Operations of the holy Ghost, which are fitly resembled and represented by the Effects of Fire; as 1st, to enlighten with Knowledge; 2dly, to enflame with Zeal; 3dly, to burn up Corruption; 4thly, to purify the Nature; 5thly, to turn Man to its own Qualifications of Sanctity, as Fire maketh all things that it seizeth like it self.’ These Operations of the holy Ghost are the Baptism of the holy Ghost in the very Sense I contend for, viz. *purifying the Nature of Man, and turning him to Sanctity.* As to the Citation from *Malachi*, the *Vindicator* says, p. 102, ‘ it is allegorical, and what great Matter is to

‘ be concluded from such figurative Expressions?’ I answer, that from figurative and prophetick Expressions of outward Cleansing, the real inward Cleansing of the Heart, or *Gospel Purification* is to be concluded; and that those Words of *Malachi* are predictive thereof. But the *Vindicator* queries, ‘ Must purifying, and refining, and purging, wherever they relate to the Messiah in the Old Testament be applied to a Baptism with the Spirit in the New?’ To which I answer, they must, wherever they are predictive of inward Purification; as ’tis manifest they are in this Place, by the End, Intent, and Purpose thereof expressly mentioned, viz. *That they may offer unto the Lord an Offering in Righteousness. Then shall the Offerings of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto the Lord, as in the Days of old, and as in former Years.* Which Expressions plainly shew the Mistake of the *Vindicator*, and such Commentators as take the Words in those Verses in a threatening Sense.

The *Vindicator's* next Attempt is to shew that the Words of *Joel* (*And it shall come to pass in the last Days, saith God, that I will pour out of my Spirit on all Flesh*) are to be understood only of a few, who were to be favoured with extraordinary Gifts. Himself had acknowledged in his *Defence*, that ‘ this Prophecy is uttered in the greatest Latitude and most comprehensive Words.’ He had also said, that ‘ the extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit were limited to a few.’ In my *Reply*, p. 55. I desired him ‘ to produce, if he could, any Writer either sacred or prophane, that ever used the Word *All* to express the far lesser of two Numbers, or only ‘ a few.’ In answer to this he now cites a parcel of Texts in the Margin of his *Vindication* p. 105. which he advises me to consult. I have so done, and find that not one of them comes up to the Point they are produced for; which probably himself was conscious of, and therefore he did not rehearse the Words of any of them.

However, he gives one Instance, which is *Isaiab*, xl. 5. *And the Glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all*
Flesh

Flesh shall see it together. ‘ Now, says he, I would ask the Replier whether this be true in the same wide Sense it is spoken.’ To which I readily answer him, That I think it is true in the same wide Sense in which it is spoken, and that the Words *all Flesh* do relate to *Mankind in General*. For I do not restrict that Prophecy to those only who saw *Christ’s* outward Person in *Judea*, but I think it extends farther, even to the Time of the general Gathering together of all Nations predicted by the Prophets, when the *Righteousness* of the gospel Dispensation, shall go forth as *Brightness*, and the *Salvation thereof as a Lamp that burneth*, when the Gentiles shall see the *Righteousness* of *Christ*, and all Kings his *Glory*, Isa. lxii. 1, 2. *When Nation shall not lift up Sword against Nation, neither shall they learn War any more*, Micah. iv. 3. *When the Kingdoms of this World shall become the Kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever*, Rev. xi. 15.

But to return to the Prophecy of *Joel*; ’tis agreed by both of us, that the pouring forth of the Spirit there mentioned, is the same with the Baptism of the Holy Ghost; and I think the *Vindicator* has given up the Point of restricting it to extraordinary Gifts only, when in p. 107. he says, that ‘ this pouring forth of the Spirit,’ was to be evident, not only ‘ in greater and more miraculous Effects, but likewise in a more conspicuous Holiness of Mens Lives and Conversations, an Effect of the ordinary Operations of the Spirit.’ And adds, ‘ Certainly in this Sense it is to be understood, and in this Sense it was verified and fulfilled, both as to miraculous Effects in the first Ages of Christianity, and as to all others then, and even at this Day.’ But though he has given up this Point, yet he is for understanding *Joel’s* Prophecy in such a limited Sense, as to exclude all *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Infidels*. Against such an Exclusion, I produced several Texts of Scripture, viz. Acts, x. 34. 35, *God is no Respector of Persons, but in every Nation, he that feareth him and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him.* I

Tim.

Tim. ii. 4. *Who will have all Men to be saved, and come unto the Knowledge of the Truth*, and several Others. To which the *Vindicator*, p. 107, answers, ‘ that these
 ‘ Texts are only general Declarations of God’s Good-
 ‘ ness to all Mankind, and his Readiness to accept such
 ‘ as do their Duty ; but here is not one Word of the
 ‘ unlimited Gifts of his holy Spirit to them all except
 ‘ in this Prophecy.’ Now, to me it appears plain,
 that general Declarations of God’s Goodness to all Man-
 kind, and of his Readiness to accept such as do their
 Duty, necessarily imply such a Gift of his Spirit unto
 all Mankind, as to shew them their Duty, and afford
 them Power to do it, and thereby place them under a
 Possibility of performing it. For God *who delighteth*
in Mercy, Mich. vii. 18. and *willeth the Salvation of all*
Men, 1 Tim. ii. 4. hath undoubtedly made *Salvation*
 possible to all Men ; and by necessary Consequence
 must have afforded them a sufficient Means for attaining
 that Salvation ; which Means is Christ Jesus, who by
 his Grace and good Spirit, *enlightens every Man that*
cometh into the World. So that the Grace or Spirit of
 Christ is universal, and such a Manifestation thereof
 given to every Man, as, if obeyed, will lead him to the
 Knowledge and Performance of his necessary Duty. In
 this respect *all Mankind* are under a Covenant of Grace
 and Mercy, and *there is neither Greek nor Jew, Circum-*
cision nor Uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor
free, but Christ is all, and in all, Colos. iii. 11. *He is the*
Saviour of all Men, but especially of them that believe,
 1 Tim. iv. 10. The *Vindicator* is therefore mistaken
 when he says, ‘ the Holy Spirit is restrained only to those
 ‘ who profess the Gospel.’ The Spirit of God striveth
 with all to reclaim them from their evil Ways : Thus
 strove he with the old World, who yet by continued
 Rebellion, at length provoked him to their Destruction :
My Spirit, saith he, *shall not always strive with Man*.
 Gen. vi. 3. So also under the Gospel Dispensation ;
 the Spirit of Truth is given not only for the Comfort of
 the Believers, but also to *reprove the World of Sin*, John
 xvi.

xvi. 8. He should have consider'd that in the scripture Phrase the *Children of God* are distinguished, not by the Profession of the Gospel, but by their being *led by the Spirit of God*, Rom. viii. 14. I presume the *Vindicator* will not deny, that there have been, and no doubt still are, *pious and virtuous Men* among those who have not the Benefit of the Holy Scriptures, nor the Knowledge of Christ as *manifested in the Flesh*; and on the other hand, that there are too many *wicked, profane, and ungodly Men*, who profess the Gospel and Christianity. This being the Case, the *former* are the *Sons of God*, and not the *latter*; the *former* are in a State of *Acceptance* with God, the *latter* are not so. He, saith the beloved Disciple, that doth *Righteousness is righteous* (or accepted of God, *Acts. x. 35.*) *He that committeth Sin is of the Devil*, 1 John iii. 7, 8. *Virtuous and godly Men*, where ever found, are not properly termed *Infidels*: Neither are *vicious and ungodly Men*, let them profess what they will, properly called *Believers*. The Spirit of Christ is the universal Teacher of *Virtue*: Those Persons, in every Nation, who live in a sincere Conformity to the Dictates of that Spirit, are so far *Christians*, and in a State of Acceptance with God thro' Christ, the Saviour of ALL MEN. Those Persons, in every Nation, who manifest wilful Disobedience to the Dictates of that Spirit, by wicked and ungodly Living, are *Antichristian*, let their Pretences be what they will. 'It is not, saith Archbishop Tillotson, a being gilded over with the external Profession of Christianity, that will avail us; our Religion must be a vital Principle, inwardly to change and transform us. What the Apostle says concerning Circumcision, we may apply to them that are baptized (*viz. with Water*) and make an outward Profession of Christianity: Baptism verily profiteth, if we obey the Gospel, but if we walk contrary to the Precepts of it, our Baptism is no Baptism, and our Christianity is Heathenism.' — 'And the Reason why we are Christians, rather than *Jews, Turks, or Heathens*, is because Christian Religion had the fortune to come first in our Way, and to be-speak us at our

' Entrance

‘ Enterance into the World.’ *Sermons preached upon several Occasions*, 1671. p. 258, 259.

‘ There is no such Error and Heresie, nothing, so fundamentally opposite to Religion, as a wicked Life.’ *Ibid* p. 261.

I have cited these Passages as a proper Check to the *Vindicator*, in his laying too great a Stress on *professing the Gospel*. But he proceeds (*Vind.* p. 107.) thus, ‘ As to those that are without, thousands of them know nothing of the Holy Spirit, many of them know but little of God, none of them a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead.’ I think, the Distinction he here makes, as if those *who know something of God, may yet know nothing of the holy Spirit*, plainly imports that himself (while he talks of a Trinity of Persons) is not clear in the Belief of their Unity. But, by what Authority does he involve those that are without (*viz.* without the Profession of Christianity) in such gross Stupidity and Ignorance? The Apostle *Paul* would inform him better, and that the Gentiles which have not the Law, do by Nature the Things contained in the Law, that, having not the Law, they are a Law unto themselves, and shew the Work of the Law written in their Hearts, *Rom. ii. 14, 15*. I would intreat the *Vindicator*, for the better Information of his own Ignorance in this Point, to read Bishop *Taylor’s* *Ductor Dubitantium*, p. 793, 794, where he discovers a far more charitable, and more scriptural Opinion: ‘ *Paul, saith he, celebrating the immense Love of God to Mankind, says, that God would have all Men to be saved; and in order to this, he adds, he would have all Men come to the Knowledge of the Truth, as knowing this to be the only Way. No Man can be saved, unless he knows saving Truth; but every Man may be saved, unless it be his own Fault; and therefore there is to every Man revealed so much Truth as is sufficient to his Salvation.*——We are sure that all Men have the Law of God written in their Hearts.——That no Man hath just Cause to say *he knows not God*. We see also, that the Heathens are not Fools, that they understand

‘ *Arts*

‘ *Arts and Sciences*, that they discourse rarely well of
 ‘ the Works of God, of Good and Evil, of Punishment
 ‘ and Reward ; and it were strange, it should be im-
 ‘ possible for them to know what is necessary ; and
 ‘ stranger yet, that God should exact that of them,
 ‘ which is not possible for them to know. But yet on
 ‘ the other Side, we see infinite Numbers of Christians,
 ‘ (i. e. *Professors of Christianity*) that know very little of
 ‘ God, and very many for whom there is no Course
 ‘ taken (i. e. by outward Means) that they should know
 ‘ him ; and what shall be the Event of these Things,
 ‘ is hard to tell. But it is very certain, that *without a*
 ‘ *Man’s own Fault*, no Man shall eternally perish. And
 ‘ therefore it is also certain, that every Man (i. e. whe-
 ‘ ther he profess Christianity or not,) that will use what
 ‘ Diligence he can and ought *in his Circumstances*, he
 ‘ shall know all, that *in his Circumstances* is necessary.—
 ‘ Every Man hath enough of Knowledge to make him
 ‘ good, if he pleases.—Men have enough of Reason
 ‘ and Law put into their Hearts, by which they read
 ‘ the Will of God ; and therefore *no Man* can in the
 ‘ universal Lines and Measures of *Salvation* pretend Ig-
 ‘ norance.’ Again, ‘ What God hath made necessary
 ‘ to be known, he hath given *sufficient Means*, by which
 ‘ it can be known.’ This *sufficient Means*, he saith, p.
 180, is *Christ*, whom he calls *the Word of the Father and*
the Law, and saith, ‘ That this *Word or Law of the Fa-*
 ‘ *ther* was the Instrument of teaching Mankind in all
 ‘ Periods of the World.’

The *Vindicator*, from the Text Luke xi. 13. *How*
much more shall your heavenly Father give the holy Spirit to
to them that ask him, and Verse 10, *Every one that asketh*
receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, draws a mistaken
 Inference, that ‘ having the holy Spirit is ONLY the Ef-
 ‘ fect of Prayer.’ Which ONLY is an Addition of his
 own, which the Text doth not warrant : Nor are the
 infinite Mercies of God, and the Discoveries of his holy
 Spirit, to be restricted to the Petitions of Men. The
 Scripture extends them farther : *I was found of them*

I

that

that sought me not, I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me, Rom. x. 20. All Day long I have stretched forth my Hands unto a disobedient and gain saying People. And saith the Psalmist, speaking of Christ, Thou hast ascended up on high, thou hast led Captivity captive : Thou hast received Gifts for Men, yea, for the REBELLIOUS also, that the Lord God might dwell among them, Psal. lxxviii. 18. The *Vindicator's* Query then, p. 108, ' Now ' if this is so, as those that are without know nothing of ' this holy Spirit, so we may be sure they never pray ' for it : And if they never pray for it, how can they ' ever have it ? ' appearing to be founded on a meer groundless Mistake of his own, contrary to Scripture Testimony, needs no farther Reply.

But, says the *Vindicator*, ' Indeed, if we allow that ' this general Pouring out of the Spirit extended to all ' Mankind without Exception, then, I think, it will ' follow, that they all with respect to their Privileges ' here, and their Reward hereafter, are equally Ob- ' jects of God's Grace and Favour.' A Consequence, which, as far as it relates to a sufficient Means for every Man's Salvation, seems to me altogether just and rational, and fully confirmed by the Testimonies of holy Scripture herein before adduced. ' But, adds the Vin- ' dicator, if so, then I do not see what Advantage it is ' to Us to be in Covenant with God, and to have a ' federal Right to all the Blessings of the Gospel, and ' the Recompence annexed to them.' By *Us* here, he plainly means a Party of Men, exclusive of others ; whereas I have already prov'd from Scripture, that a Manifestation of the Grace and good Spirit of God under the Gospel is extended to *Us* Mankind in general. ' That the Gospel is a Covenant,' I own ; and ' that the Gift of the holy Spirit is one of the great Blessings which is annexed to this Covenant,' I also own. But then I understand not this Covenant to be a *singular* and *particular* Favour to a particular Set of Men only, as the *Vindicator* does ; but I understand it to be, as the Scripture doth, a Covenant of unlimited Mercy exhibited

to all Mankind without Exception. To this the *Vindicator* replies, ' If this Gift then is granted to all without Exception, what availeth it to be a Christian, more than to be a *Jew*, a *Turk*, or an *Infidel*? ' To which I answer, That it appears to me, after reading in, and meditating on the holy Scriptures, that a Gift of the Grace and good Spirit of God is exhibited to every Man, without Exception ; and that from every Man, without Exception, are required *Faith and Obedience* in Proportion to the Gift to him given ; or, as the Apostle expresses it, Rom. xii. 13, *According as God hath dealt to every Man the Measure of Faith*: Which Expression, I think, plainly denotes, that one and the same *Measure of Faith* is not required of every Man. But, as God hath distributed to every Man, as the Lord hath called every One, so let him walk, 1 Cor. vii. 17. No Man, who walks according to the Measure of the Grace he has received, ought to be called an *Heathen* or *Infidel*, for this Reason, because God, without Respect of Persons, judgeth according to every Man's Work, 1 Pet. i. 17. and, In every Nation, he that feareth him and worketh Righteousness, is accepted with him. Which Acceptance is thro' Christ, alone, who gave himself a Ransom for all, 1 Tim. ii. 6. The holy Scripture doth no where restrict the Benefit of the Death of Christ to the explicit Knowledge of it ; for as Bishop Burnet well says, ' It is certain that God may pardon Sin only upon that Score, without obliging all Men to believe it, especially when it is not revealed to them.——In a Word, says he, all that are saved are saved by Christ ; but whether all these shall be called to the explicit Knowledge of him, is more than we have any good Ground to affirm.' *Exposition of the 39 Articles*, Edit. 2. p. 173, 174. Again, he says, ' God applies the Death of Christ by the secret Methods of Grace to many Persons whose Circumstances do render them incapable of the express Acts of laying hold on it, the Want of those being supplied by the Goodness of God.' *Ibid. Art. 7. p. 100.*

‘ And, *saith Archbishop Tillotson*, good Men in all
 ‘ Ages and Nations from the Beginning of the World,
 ‘ both before the Law and under the Law, and with-
 ‘ out the Law, such as *feared God and wrought Righte-
 ‘ ousness*, were accepted of God in that Name, and by
 ‘ the meritorious Sacrifice of that Lamb of God, which
 ‘ in Respect of the Virtue and Efficacy of it was said to
 ‘ have been *slain from the Foundation of the World.*’ *Ser-
 mons in Octavo.* Vol. 11. p. 162. 1704.

But the *Vindicator*, p. 109, insinuates, that ‘ we are
 ‘ not upon a true and safe Foundation, when we argue
 ‘ from God’s general Care and Love to Mankind, that
 ‘ all are *equally* Objects of his Favour.’ Now what we
 have insisted upon, and I think proved, is that the *Gos-
 pel Covenant* is a Covenant of God’s general Care and
 Love to all Mankind, and that no Man is excluded
 therefrom, but by means of his own Transgression and
 Disobedience. In which Sense they are all equally Ob-
 jects of his Favour; but it doth by no means follow from
 thence, that he doth not extend any particular and spe-
 cial Favours to some particular Persons, to qualify them
 for particular Services to which they may be called; as
 in the Instances of the Apostle *Paul*, and indeed of all
 the Apostles, and even of all true Ministers in succeeding
 Times, with whom he seems to have promised his Pre-
 sence to the End of the World, to enable them for the
 particular Services to which they are called. This I
 think may reasonably be admitted, and yet the *univer-
 sal Gospel Covenant of God’s Love may include both them
 and every Man else that cometh into the World.*

The Reader will, I hope, excuse my dwelling so long
 on a few Pages of the *Vindication*, because I thought it
 my Duty to defend the *Scripture Doctrine of the free Grace
 and Mercy of God exhibited unto all Mankind*, through the
*Gospel Covenant of universal Light and Salvation by Jesus
 Christ*, the very Foundation of *preaching the Gospel to
 every Creatnre under Heaven*, Col. i. 23. from the mean,
 narrow, and partial Conceptions which the *Vindicator*
 appears to have entertain’d concerning it.

His

His last two Paragraphs in this Section, p. 110, 111, are but a Repetition of what he had before said, and we have before replied to.

S E C T. VI.

Concerning Infant-Baptism.

THOUGH Water-baptism is frequently made mention of in holy Scripture, as having been a Ceremony in use among the *Jews*, and also as appertaining to the Ministry of *John* the Baptist, the Forerunner of Christ; yet was it at best, but a Shadow or Figure of a better Thing to come, *namely*, the Cleansing and Purifying of the Heart and Conscience by the Baptism of the holy Ghost.

But of *Infant-baptism* there is no mention in holy Scripture; for which reason the *Vindicator* having no direct Proof from thence for the Practice of it, is obliged only to argue from *pretended Parallels* and imaginary Consequences. He said in his *Defence*, p. 46, ‘ Is it not a natural Consequence to draw a Parallel between *Infant-Circumcision* and *Infant-Baptism*? God commanded *Abraham* to circumcise his Children, and that was the *Rite* by which they entred into Covenant with him, and were made Partakers of the Blessing of that Covenant. Now unless you’ll make Christian Children in a worse Condition than *Jewish*, they sure are capable of entering into Covenant with God, and by that Baptism which Christ instituted, to have all the Blessings of this new Covenant sealed to them.’

To this I replied, that ‘ The Parallel he would pretend to draw is so far from being a *natural Consequence*, that the different Nature of the two Covenants doth expressly militate against it; for,

‘ The

‘ The *Jewish* or *Old Covenant* being outward, and
 ‘ relating to the Inheritance of an outward Country by
 ‘ the natural Descendents of a particular Person, it be-
 ‘ haved that they should be distinguished from the other
 ‘ Nations by a particular outward Sign or Token in
 ‘ their Flesh.

‘ But the *Christian* or *New Covenant* being inward and
 ‘ spiritual, and *established upon better Promises*, viz. of
 ‘ *an Inheritance incorruptible, and that fadeth not away*,
 ‘ limited to no particular Nation, Place, or Persons,
 ‘ the Reason of any such external, distinguishing Sign,
 ‘ Mark or Token, is wholly ceased, there being no
 ‘ particular or specifick Subjects to be distinguished
 ‘ thereby, for *there is now neither Jew nor Greek, bond*
 ‘ *nor free, Male nor Female, but all are one in Christ Je-*
 ‘ *sus, Gal. iii. 28.* So that our Opponents imaginary
 ‘ Parallel can by no means be admitted, because it sup-
 ‘ poses a Parity where none is, and a Similitude of Na-
 ‘ tures in the two Covenants, which the Scripture de-
 ‘ clares to be quite different. *I will make a new Cove-*
 ‘ *nant with the House of Israel, and with the House of*
 ‘ *Judah, not according to the Covenant that I made with*
 ‘ *their Fathers, Heb. viii. 8, 9.* But our Opponent
 ‘ would represent this *New Covenant* to be like the *Old*
 ‘ *one*, and to be attended with outward Rites and Ce-
 ‘ remonies similar to the Old, which were long since
 ‘ abolished, and vanished away.’

I repeat this, because, I think, the *Vindicator* has not
 answer’d it; however, I shall also consider what he
 says, viz.

Vind. p. 112. ‘ In the *Defence* I had said, that the
 ‘ Descendents of *Abraham* had entred into Covenant by
 ‘ Circumcision, and produced two Texts to support
 ‘ that Assertion, viz. *Deut. v. 3.* and *xxix. 11, 12.*
 ‘ where it is said, *The Lord made not this Covenant with*
 ‘ *our Fathers, but with us, even with us who are all of us*
 ‘ *alive this Day*: Where Children must needs be com-
 ‘ prehended, as being living Members of that Church.
 ‘ Likewise, *Ye all stand here this Day, your little ones,*
 ‘ *your*

‘ *your Wives, &c. that thou shouldst enter into Covenant with the Lord thy God.* These two Texts the *Replier* has wholly passed over, as being of such *glaring Evidence* against him, that he knew not how to reply to them.’

Now the very Truth is, that his *Impertinence* in producing them seemed to me so *glaring* as to need no Reply; for neither of those Texts, nor the Covenant there mentioned, have any relation at all to Circumcision. ’Twas a Covenant of serving the Lord and refraining from Idolatry, not of being circumcised; as I think the *Vindicator* might have seen, (had he not shut his Eyes against the most glaring Evidence) by *their Wives* being included therein.

But to shew that *Infants* may make Covenants, he tells us, that ‘ a Covenant is only a Contract between two Parties : ’ But in that he mistakes; for a *Covenant is also a Promise of any one Party only, made to the other.* His Comparison between *Infants* under the *Law* and those under the *Gospel* does not hold, because *Infants* were really of the *Seed of Abraham* after the *Flesh*; but under the *Gospel*, those only are called the *Children of Abraham* who are of the *Faith of Abraham*: And that *Infants* have that *Faith*, is not easy to demonstrate. Again, his Parallel between Circumcision and Water-baptism does not at all hold, for the one did affix a Mark or Sign in the *Flesh*, which the other doth not.

His Discourse, p. 114, 115, shewing that *outward Circumcision* was the Shadow of *spiritual Circumcision*, and the *Symbol* of an *holy Nation*; and that the *Earthly Canaan* was the Shadow of an *Heavenly Inheritance*, militates strongly against himself; for if those were Types & Figures and Shadows of the great Blessings of the *Gospel Dispensation*, that Dispensation being introduced, they have their Period and Accomplishment: And the Inference which naturally follows will be, that *Water baptism* being an *external Rite*, and only a Shadow of *spiritual Circumcision*, as *outward Circumcision* also was, is no more necessary under the *Gospel Dispensation* than outward Circumcision it self. In

In p. 116, the *Vindicator* lays down a most erroneous and antisciptural Position, and which aggravates his Fault in so doing, says he has prov'd it, viz. that ' Water-baptism is the only Mean whereby we put on ' Christ, and are admitted into Covenant with him, and ' have a federal *Rite* (I suppose he means *Right*) to Salvation.' Now, *the only Mean* must be exclusive of all other Means: Whereas, 'tis plain, the Scripture speaks of other Means whereby we put on Christ, whereby we are admitted into Covenant with him, and whereby we have (if we may so speak) a federal Right to his Salvation: The Scripture Mean of putting on Christ, is Rom. xiii. 13, 14, *Walking honestly as in the Day, not in Rioting and Drunkenness, not in Chambering and Wantonness, not in Strife and Envy, making no Provision for the Flesh to fulfil the Lusts thereof.* Eph. iv. 24. *A putting off concerning the former Conversation the old Man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful Lusts, and being renewed in the Spirit of our Mind.* The Scripture Means of being admitted into Covenant with Christ is by the pure Work of the Spirit of God on the Souls of Men; *This is the Covenant that I will make with the House of Israel in those Days, saith the Lord, I will put my Laws into their Mind, and write them in their Hearts,* Heb. viii. 10. Not by any external Rite or ceremonial Performance to be done by Man. The Scripture Means of Salvation, or having a federal Right, if we may so speak, to Salvation, is, Primarily, *Christ himself*, whom God hath given for a *Light of the Gentiles, and that he should be for Salvation to the Ends of the Earth,* Acts xiii. 47. *Through him we both (Jews and Gentiles) have Access by one Spirit unto the Father,* Eph. ii. 18. Secondarily, *Faith and Obedience.* 1 Pet. i. 9. *Receiving the End of your Faith, even the Salvation of your Souls.* Heb. v. 9. *He, Christ, became the eternal Salvation unto all them that obey him.* These are the Scripture Means of putting on Christ, of Admission into Covenant with him, and of being entituled to his Salvation. How the *Vindicator* came to pass over them all, and substitute *Water-baptism* as the ONLY MEAN, is not easy

easy to account for, without admitting that his *Zeal* for that Ceremony has blinded him.

His next Point is to shew that the Words *Teach all Nations*, Mat. xxviii. 19. have Relation to Subjects *uncapable of being taught*, and in order to that, he will needs have the Word *μαθητεύσατε* to signify not only to *teach*, but to *disciple* or *make Disciples*. He seems indeed to acknowledge, p. 118, that the Word *μαθητεύω* signifies to *teach*, viz. Persons of grown Years, but says, that it may also signify to *make Disciples*, which he pretends, absurdly enough, may be done without *Teaching*. He tells us, p. 119, 'that *Disciple*, in the Scripture Sense, 'and *Scholar*, are not synonymous,' but gives not a single Instance from thence, where that Word is applied to one that never learnt. He asserts indeed that the little Children, *τα ἑρπύον*, Infants or sucking Babes, *Luke* xviii. 15, that were brought to Christ, were *Disciples*; tho' neither that Text nor any other calls them so. Instead of Proof he brings the Testimony of *Lesly*, whose Evidence, to us, makes a Thing more doubtful. He owns, p. 120, that 'the Word *μαθητεύω* is derived from *μαθήτης* and that from *μανθάνω* to learn.' But, p. 121, 'that it has a different Meaning from it,' and gives this Reason, 'for *μαθητεύω* to *disciple*, is a Verb Active, and 'has an intire Relation to the Apostles, not to the Nations.' It seems then, that though the Apostles were to teach the Nations, yet the Nations were not to learn: Surely the *Vindicator's* Logick has dimm'd his Reason, or he would be asham'd of such Arguing. His Perversion, in this Page, of my Words, I pass by, because I can't expect he should treat me with more Civility than he does the Text.

He feigns Tautology in the Text where none is, while his own Way of Interpreting imports a gross one: He will have the Word *μαθητεύσατε* not to signify *teach*, but *baptize*; in which Sense the Text will read thus, *Go, baptize all Nations, baptizing them*: But this he can let pass, because 'tis his own.

I had queried in my *Reply*, p. 66, ‘whether the Word ‘*them*, after *teaching*, did not relate to the same Antecedent with the Word ‘*them* after *baptizing*?’ To which he answers, p. 122, ‘That *Infants* may be baptized, or made Disciples, without or before Teaching; and therefore Teaching must be subsequent to that, when they become capable of it: Consequently the Relative ‘*them*, with respect to Teaching, must be taken in a more restrained Sense than the Relative ‘*them*, with respect to Baptizing.’ Thus taking for granted the Point in debate, viz. *That Infants may be made Disciples without teaching*, he forces the Text to his own *Hypothesis*: When indeed the plain and natural Import of it would determine the Matter against him. He tells us, p. 123, that ‘if we look into the New Testament, we shall find the Teaching previous to Baptism to be but small.’ But whether *small* or *great*, ’tis against him, seeing *Infants* are not capable of any. He owns, that the Apostles ‘required of their *Catechumens* Faith in Christ, which if they professed, they were ‘immediately baptized.’ This also makes against himself, who pleads for baptizing those that are incapable either of having Faith or making any Profession of it. But whatever the Apostles practised, he asserts, p. 124, that ‘Teaching in the Commission is made subsequent to baptizing,’ whereas ’tis only made so by his own Interpretation of the Word *μαθητεύσατε*, which, unless forced from its own proper Sense, signifies *Teaching*, and is placed antecedent, not subsequent, to *baptizing*.

He comes next to the Texts which speak of *Households being baptized*; which Texts, ’tis plain, denote no more than those Persons whom the Apostle preached to, who, I think, were not *Infants*: Though Dr. Lightfoot and the *Vindicator* are of another Opinion.

The next Text is 1 Cor. vii. 14, *The unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the Husband, else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.* This Text the *Vindicator* owns doth not mention *Water-baptism*; but will have it, that
the

the Word *holy* usually denotes being *baptized with Water*, and the Word *unholy* being *not so baptized*. And tells us, p. 127, that ‘ it will appear by many Quotations from the ancient Christians, that there is nothing more common with them than to call *Baptism* by the Name of Sanctification, and to say *sanctified* or *holy* instead of *baptized*, and to give Persons, while they are unbaptized, the Name of unclean.’ That many Citations are produced by Dr. *Wall* from the ancient Fathers, where they call *Water-baptism* Regeneration, and that they do ascribe Sanctity or Holiness thereto, we admit. But that they did therein keep to the proper and scriptural Sense of those Terms does not appear. Let any one for an Experiment, in reading the New Testament, substitute the Word *Water-baptism* instead of the Word *Holiness*, and instead of the Words *sanctified* or *holy* read the Words *baptized with Water* or *unbaptized with Water*, and the many Absurdities and Perversions of the plain Sense of Scripture arising from such an Application will be a most convincing Argument of its Impropriety.

The next Text considered in my *Reply*, p. 69, was *Eph. iii. 3. And were by Nature the Children of Wrath, even as others*, which the *Vindicator* in his former *Defence* would have extended to *Infants*: I shewed him his Mistake therein, which as he does not undertake to vindicate, I wish he had Ingenuity enough to have acknowledged.

The *Vindicator* comes, p. 128, to the Text *Mat. xix. 14, Suffer little Children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*. He owns that ‘ the Verses cited do plainly shew that we are to imitate little Children in their Humility,’ but queries thus, ‘ Are Children when they come into the World void of all Guilt?’ I answer him, that *I think they are*, and that by Virtue of the one Offering of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath put away Sin by the Sacrifice of himself, the whole Race of Mankind stand accepted and approved in the Sight of God (notwith-

standing the Sin of *Adam*) until by their own actual Transgression and Disobedience they alienate themselves. So that *Infants*, before actual Transgression, are not 'to be considered with Relation to *Adam's* Fall and the 'Curse of Death, as *Children of Wrath*;' but they are to be considered with Relation to the Restoration and Blessing of Life, which is come by Jesus Christ, as Children of the Grace and Mercy of God, and Heirs of Salvation. For as by the Offence of One Judgment came upon all Men unto Condemnation, even so by the Righteousness of One the free Gift came upon all Men unto Justification of Life, Rom. v. 18. Seeing then that the holy Scriptures give sufficient Ground to believe, that all *Infants* under the Gospel are in a State of Salvation, and delivered from the Wrath of God, there is no just Foundation for the Use of Water-baptism respecting them, under pretence of doing for them what Christ hath already done, viz. *the making them Members of Christ, Children of God, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven*. So that I apprehend the *Vindicator* to be much mistaken, when speaking of *Infants* he says, p. 132, 'God has not 'revealed to us what he will do with them.' For as God hath expressly declared, that *he will have all Men to be saved*, 1 Tim. ii. 4. and that *Christ gave himself a Ransom for all*, he hath by those general Declarations sufficiently reveal'd to us, that *Infants*, the most innocent Part of the Human kind, are not excluded from his Salvation.

The *Vindicator* asserts, p. 133. that 'Baptism, he 'means *Water-baptism*, is the Channel through which the 'Blessings of God must pass.' And yet in Christ's Sermon on the Mount, among the several Conditions there pronounced to be blessed, we do not find, that of being baptized with Water to be any of them. Nor do we any where in the new Testament find the Blessing expressly annexed to this Ceremony. Nor is *Water-baptism* in the Scripture dignifi'd with any such Appellation, as *the necessary Channel for conveying God's Blessings*. That Term therefore I conclude to be a meer

meer Figment of the *Vindicator's*, neither supportable by Scripture, nor agreeable to right Reason. But he tells us, p. 133. that ' the *Jewish* Circumcision, was only ' a ceremonial Performance, yet it was by undergoing ' that, that the *Jews* were intituled to God's Blessing.' He should have considered that the Scriptures testify that God did abundantly bless them in their Journey through the Wilderness, *commanded the Clouds from above, and opened the Doors of Heaven, rained down Manna upon them, and gave them the Corn of Heaven, fed them with Angels Food, and sent them Meat to the full: let it fall in the Midst of the Camp round about their Habitations: led them with a Cloud, and all the Night with a Light of Fire*, Psal. lxxviii. And yet during all this showering down of the Blessings of God upon them, they were found in the *Disuse of that ceremonial Performance*, which the *Vindicator* says intituled them thereto. See *Josh.* v. 7.

The *Vindicator* tells us p. 134. that he contends not for Majority but *Universality*, when he says, *I am Confident that all Christians are of Opinion, that Water-baptism is necessary* (necessitate præcepti) *to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* Which confident Assertion of his, he more confidently attempts to prove, by making that Opinion the Standard of Christianity, and unchristianly excluding out of the Christian Church all those who think otherwise. But until he shall produce his Authority for Unchristianing whom he pleases, his confident and rash Assertion of *Universality* in this Case can probably have no other Effect, than the exposing himself to the *universal* Contempt of calm and rational Readers.

In my *Reply*, p. 74, 75. are these Queries, ' Will not ' the Church of *Rome* in the Case of Transubstantiation ' ask (like as he does in the Case of Water-baptism) ' Whether the Sense of a Text that had been expounded ' of *Transubstantiation* by the whole Christian Church ' for 1500 Years, is not to be prefer'd to the Sense ' which a few Moderns at the Reformation did put up-
' on

‘ on it ? And will she not upon the Plea of Majority
 ‘ and Antiquity, carry her Sense of that and other
 ‘ Texts, against any *Protestant Church* whatsoever ?’
 To this the *Vindicator*, p. 134, 135. answers, ‘ that the
 ‘ Cases are not parallel ; for the Christian Church from
 ‘ the Apostles Time always practised Water-baptism,
 ‘ but the said Church did not always believe Transub-
 ‘ stantiation.’ In which *Reply*, he does but evade
 the Point in Dispute instead of answering it, for the
 Question is not, *Whether the Christian Church did*
always believe Transubstantiation ? But it is, whether the
Papists will not as confidently assert, *that the Christian*
Church did always believe Transubstantiation, as he does,
that the Christian Church did always practise Water-bap-
tism ? His talk therefore of my ‘ great Ignorance in the
 ‘ *Popish Controversy*,’ only discovers his own Weak-
 ness in not discerning the Stress of my Argument, which
 depends not upon the real Antiquity of Transubstantia-
 tion, but upon the Pretence of the Church of *Rome* to
 its Antiquity, for ’tis certain, she pretends to derive the
Hocus Pocus Doctrine of Transubstantiation from the
 Words of Christ himself, *Hoc est Corpus meum* : And as
 she has long pretended to be the Catholick Church, has
 long made use of the Pleas of *Universality and Anti-*
quity : And I think ’tis no prudence, in a Controversie
 between *Protestants*, to fight one another with her
 Weapons.

The next Text to be considered is *John* iii. 5. *Except*
a Man be born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot enter
into the Kingdom of God. ‘ This Text, says the *Vindica-*
 ‘ *tor*, p. 133. is pretty largely treated of by Dr. Bennet
 ‘ in his *Confutation of Quakerism*, p. 272. but where has
 ‘ * his Reasoning ever been answered.’ But what have
 we to do with Dr. Bennet : The *Vindicator*, no doubt,
 has borrow’d some Arrows out of Dr. Bennet’s Quiver,
 and so far as he has used Dr. Bennet’s Way of Reasoning,
 I have

* His Reasoning has been answer’d by B. Lindley, as before mentioned, p. 58.

I have considered it ; which is all the present Controversy between us can require.

To shew that this Text *John* iii. 5. is not to be understood of Elementary Water, I produced in my *Reply*, p. 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, a large Quotation, including the Opinion of *Calvin* and several Learned Men thereon, and strongly supporting their Opinion by Texts of Scripture : All this Strength of Learning and Scripture the *Vindicator*, p. 136, knocks down with a single Blow of his *Herculean Club*, his ‘ exceeding good Argument’ of Universality and Majority ; and passes over it as beneath his farther Notice.

That the Term *born of Water*, without mention of the Spirit, doth no where occur in the New Testament, he cannot deny ; and what I said in my *Reply*, p. 80, that ‘ Christ in the same Discourse, several times repeats ‘ the Term *born of the Spirit*, without mention of Water, and also explicates that Term in such a Manner ‘ as cannot be understood of *material Water*,’ he hath not disproved ; but has Recourse again, p. 127, to *the Sign*, and *the Thing signified*, making them both *equally necessary* ; the Absurdity of which we have herein several Times before made appear, particularly in p. 56, 57.

The *Vindicator*, p. 138, urges that the Term *born again*, Verse 3, is explicated by the Term *born of Water and of the Spirit*, Verse 5. Admitting that, yet ’tis as evident, that the Term *born of Water and of the Spirit*, Verse 5, is explicated by *born of the Spirit* only, Vers. 6 and 8, and consequently that outward Water is not intended, but that an higher *Principle* than *Nature*, or any Thing Elementary, is necessary to *Regeneration*. He owns, p. 139, that ‘ Water is used as a Figure for ‘ different Things,’ and why it may not be used in this Text for the cleansing Virtue of the Spirit, he hath not made appear. He asserts, p. 140, that ‘ though *Elementary Water* be not, yet *Sacramental Water* may be, ‘ necessary to Salvation.’ Here he makes *Sacramental Water* to be what *Elementary Water* is not ; as though the *Water* had chang’d its Nature by some stupendious Knack
of

of Priestly Consecration. He tells us that ‘ *Eph. iii. 2.* ‘ *The Baptism that saves*, and *Titus iii. 5.* ‘ *The washing of Regeneration*, are to be understood of *Elementary* or ‘ *common Water* sanctified to higher Ends.’ He just now told us, ‘ that *Elementary Water* is not necessary to Salvation,’ but now tells us, ‘ that Salvation is to be ascribed to *Elementary Water* sanctified ;’ by which he must mean the same Thing as by *Sacramental Water*. But where does he read in Scripture of *sanctified Elementary Water* ? He may perhaps have been accustomed to read in his *Common Prayer* these Words, viz. ‘ And by ‘ the Baptism of thy well beloved Son Jesus Christ in ‘ the River of *Jordan*, didst sanctifie the Element of ‘ Water to the mystical Washing away of Sin.’ But that the holy Scriptures ascribe any such Effect to *sanctified* or *consecrated Elementary Water*, I have not read ; nor do the Texts he produces say any such Thing.

In my *Reply*, p. 81, I produced many Texts of Scripture to shew the *New Testament* Sense, or *Christian* Sense of the Terms *New Creature*, *New born*, *Born again* or *from above*, *born of the Spirit*, or, *born of God* ; which Texts so manifestly shew that those Terms were there used to denote *real Holiness*, not *outward Washing*, that the *Vindicator* himself cannot, at least does not, deny their answering the End they were produc’d for. But he still says, p. 141, ‘ That if the Phrase *born again* be ‘ an Expression grounded upon a Practice much in Use ‘ among the *Jews*, then it must be explained in the Sense ‘ the *Jews* were wont to put upon it.’ Which is a very great Mistake ; because ’tis usual under the Gospel to use such Expressions in a quite different Sense than what the *Jews* were wont to put upon them ; for Instance, *The Children of Abraham*, was an Expression among the *Jews* used to denote *the Seed of Abraham after the Flesh* ; but under the Gospel the same Expression denotes those *who walk in the Steps of the Faith of Abraham*, *Rom. iv. 12.* The Word *Circumcision* was used among the *Jews*, for the *Cutting of the Fore-skin off the Flesh* ; but under the Gospel ’tis used for the *Cleansing of the Heart*,
Rom.

Rom. ii. 29. The *Temple* was a Word used by the *Jews* to denote an *outward Building*, but under the Gospel 'tis used for the *Body of Man*, 1 Cor. vi. 19. 2 Cor. vi. 16. The Word *Passover* among the *Jews* signified the *Sacrifice and Eating of a Lamb*, but under the Gospel it denotes the *Sacrifice of Christ himself*, 1 Cor. v. 7. The Word *Jerusalem* was used among the *Jews* to denote an *Earthly City*; under the Gospel 'tis used to denote an *Heavenly One*, Gal. iv. 26. Heb. xii. 22. Rev. iii. 12. *Unleavened Bread* among the *Jews* signified *outward Food*; but under the Gospel it denotes *Sincerity and Truth*, 1 Cor. v. 8. In like Manner *Baptism* among the *Jews* signified an *outward Washing with Elementary Water*, but under the Gospel it denotes a *spiritual Cleansing by the Holy Ghost*, Mat. iii. 11. This Manner of Speaking is so usual in the New Testament, that I know not how it could escape the *Vindicator's* Observation.

The *Vindicator*, p. 143, lays down a Rule for Interpreting the Scripture. 'How, says he, is Scripture to be interpreted but by the Meaning or Acceptation of Phrases in Use at, and about the Time when it was wrote? And when we meet with any uncommon Terms or allusive Ways of Speech in it, is it not natural to search into the Sense or Meaning in which they then were understood, and if we find them so and so used, is it not usual to understand them in that Manner? Suppose we were to interpret a Latin Author, would not we have Recourse to the Idiom or Propriety, the Phraseologies, Customs or Allusions, or any other Mode of Speech, peculiar to the Author, or Time he wrote in, that we might the better give the true Sense of the Book we were to explain?' This Rule I kept closely to in my *Reply*, when, p. 81, to discover the Meaning of Christ's Expression, *born of Water and of the Spirit*, John iii. 5, I collected many like Expressions in parallel Places of the New Testament, delivered by our Saviour himself, or his Apostles, who were contemporary with him; and thence I discovered

covered the real *New Testament* Sense of those Expressions, viz. the Meaning and Acceptation of them in the first Age of Christianity, wherein they were spoken or written. But this Rule of Interpretation, though certainly right, and of the *Vindicator's* own proposing, himself will not abide by ; but is for explaining Terms used by Christ and his Apostles, not from their own Usage of them in *their own* Times, but from other Mens Usage either in *antecedent* or *subsequent* Times, viz. either from the Customs of the *Jews* who lived before, or the Expressions of the Ancient Fathers who lived after the Times of the Apostles : A Method neither just nor reasonable ; for though the Expressions might allude to Rites and Customs formerly used by the *Jews*, yet those Rites and Customs were such as the *Doctrine* of Christ and his Apostles was to *draw Men from*, not to *continue them in*. The Intent of their *Doctrine* was to bring Men off from shadowy, external, formal and ceremonial Washings with Water, to *real internal, substantial, and Evangelical Purity* and *Holiness of Spirit* ; and accordingly they used Expressions (which had been applied to another Meaning by the *Jews*) in a Sense apparently consonant and agreeable to the *Doctrine* they promulgated. The Testimony of the Fathers of After-ages in this Case is of no Validity, because 'tis apparent, that they began early to degenerate from the Primitive and Apostolick Purity of the Gospel, and wherein they depart from the *Scripture-dialect*, are not to be imitated.

* The first Rule, *saiib* Zanchius, for the preserving of Concord amongst us is, that every one keep himself within the Bounds of the Word of God, that he profess

* Prima itaque regula servandæ inter nos Consensionis est, ut quisque se contineat intra Metas verbi Dei: Nec se alterius Discipulum profiteatur quam Christi, nullamque aliam doctrinam sibi sequendam proponat, quam Verbum Dei in sacris Literis expressum: Hoc est, ut non aliter loquatur, quam loquitur verbum Dei, nec alia tradat dogmata, quam quæ apertè scribuntur in sacris Literis: Sed sequamur omnes & verba & res Sacrarum Literarum. Hoc enim ut faciamus postulat fides quam profitemur in Christum. *Zanch. Orat. Tom. 7. par. 2. p. 451.*

‘ profess himself the Disciple of none but *Christ*, and
 ‘ propound no Doctrine to be followed by him but that
 ‘ which is expressed in the *holy Scriptures*, that is, that he
 ‘ speak no otherwise than *they speak*, nor deliver any
 ‘ other Opinions than what are *plainly delivered* in the
 ‘ *holy Scriptures* : But that we all follow both the *Words*
 ‘ and *Matter* therein contained. For this the Christian
 ‘ Faith, which we profess, requires us to do.’

The next Text is *Acts* ii. 38, 39, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins*. I said in my first *Answer*, p. 48, that ‘ We are under no Necessity to understand this
 ‘ Text of Water-baptism, because the Word *baptized*
 ‘ may be understood of Conversion of the Heart to
 ‘ God. This Interpretation is most agreeable to the
 ‘ Words of the same Apostle *Peter* in the next Chapter,
 ‘ *Acts* iii. 9. *Repent and be converted, that your Sins may*
 ‘ *be blotted out*.’ To this my Opponent, in his *Defence*,
 objected, that it would infer a Tautology, which, I
 think, in my *Reply*, I have shewn him it doth not. I
 queried in my *Reply*, Whether Baptism is not used for
 Conversion, in *Acts* xxii. 16. *Be baptized, and wash away*
thy Sins? To this, the *Vindicator*, p. 145, partly ob-
 jects, ‘ You will find here an unlucky Word that spoils
 ‘ the *Replier*’s absurd Conjecture, and that is *Washing* :
 ‘ *St. Paul* was to be *baptized* and to *wash away* his Sins ;
 ‘ now what can this *Washing* be reasonably applied to
 ‘ but *Water* ? ’ I answer, that the very next Words
 shew what it may be reasonably applied to, viz. *Calling*
on the Name of the Lord, an Expression importing the
Prayer of Faith, which the Apostle *James* says, *shall*
save the Sick, and if he have committed Sins, they shall be
forgiven him, *James* v. 13.

I had also queried, Whether *Baptism* is not used for
 Conversion in *Rom.* vi. 4, *We are buried with him by Bap-*
tism into Death, that like as Christ was raised from the
Dead by the Glory of the Father, even so we also should
walk in Newness of Life? To this he answers, *Vind.* p.
 146, by telling me, ‘ what the baptized Persons being

‘ put under Water alludes to.’ But I speak not of Baptism here in that Sense, nor, I think, does the Text, as I have before observed in pag. 14. foregoing.

The *Vindicator*, in his former *Defence* had insisted, that the Words, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins*, Acts ii. 38. and the Words, *Repent and be converted that your Sins may be blotted out*, do not convey the same Ideas: Wherefore, in my *Reply*, I shewed him that the same Effect, viz. *Remission of Sins*, was assigned to both of them: To which he now answers, *Vind.* p. 147. ‘ That the Sameness of Effect does not always proceed from the Sameness of Cause.’ Which is very true, but not applicable to the present Case, where the Cause is but one and the same, though express’d in different Words.

The *Vindicator*, in his former *Defence*, p. 59, had asserted, ‘ That Baptism follows after Repentance.’ This, I told him in my *Reply*, ‘ doth not hold in the Case of *Infants*,’ which he now owns, but offers no Reason to justify his different Practice; he says indeed, *Vind.* p. 148, ‘ that he did not speak of an *Infant*, but of a grown Man,’ because he added these Words, ‘ A Man is never baptized till he turns, or promises to turn from his evil Ways, which is Repentance.’ Upon which I thus remarked in my *Reply*, p. 83, 84, ‘ But for a *Salvo* in this Case, our Opponent gives us his Definition of Repentance, viz. that a Promise to turn from his evil Ways is Repentance: He does not so much as include in this Definition a sincere Intention and Purpose of Mind to perform that Promise: At this rate the disobedient Son, who said, *I go, Sir, but went not*, Mat. xxi. 30, was a Penitent. But we may object, that *new born Infants* cannot make Promises: To this he will probably answer in the Words of his Church Catechism, *that they promise both* [Repentance and Faith] *by their Sureties*: Though ’tis too often apparent, that the Sureties themselves have neither of them: Nor do the *Infants* promise any thing, but their Sureties; so that to include *Infants* within the

Verge

'Verge of Repentance, our Opponent must make his
 'Definition of Repentance yet larger, by inserting the
 'Promises of others, and then 'twill run thus, that a
 'Man is never baptized till he turn or promise to turn from
 'his evil Ways, or some other promise it for him, which is
 'Repentance. When he shall have proved that this De-
 'finition of Repentance is agreeable to Scripture, and
 'that 'tis such as the frequent Exhortations therein do
 'press Men to, he will have done ten-fold more Service
 'to the Cause of *Infant-baptism*, than by all the Argu-
 'ments he has hitherto produced.' To this he answers,
 p. 148, that 'A Definition differs from a Description.'
 Be that as it will, since he owns, 'that it may be a De-
 'scription,' I consent to call it so, rather than contend
 with so formidable a *Logician*. What then does he say in
 behalf of his *Description* of Repentance? He cites one
Binchius, a foreign Divine, saying that, *Penitentiae Vox*
significat externos Conversionis Actus, sive illa vera, sive
Simulata, which he *Englishe*s thus, *The Word Repentance*
signifies the outward Acts of Conversion, whether they (he
 should say it) *be true or counterfeit*. Which Description
 of Repentance equally includes the *Saint* and the *Hypo-*
crite: and would entitle a *false Pretence to Repentance* to
 equal Privileges with a *sincere and real Conversion*. He
 that can receive this *Doctrine*, let him: 'Tis strange, that
 a Man, who has read the Scriptures, should write thus.

'The last Thing, says the *Vindicator*, p. 149, is a-
 'bout Posterity.' I am pleas'd to come near the End,
 being almost weary with tracing him through so many
 Doublings, Windings, and Turnings. I had said in
 my *Answer* to him, that the Word *Children*, Acts ii.
 38, 'does not signify *Infants*, but Posterity in general.'
 The *Vindicator*, in his *Defence*, produced the Testimony
 of Archbishop *Laud*, (Confer. p. 56) 'That the Bap-
 'tism of *Infants* may be directly concluded out of this
 'Scripture.' The *Vindicator* himself had declared in the
 same *Def.* p. 44, that 'there is no direct Proof in
 'Scripture for it;' wherefore I shewed him in my *Re-*
ply, pag. 85, his own Contradiction to the Testimony
 produced

produced by himself from the *Archbishop*. Now the *Vindicator*, instead of defending himself from the Charge of Contradiction to the *Archbishop*, runs away with a Mistake, and busies himself, p. 151, in defending the *Archbishop* from an imaginary Self-contradiction, which no body had charg'd him with, and proceeded only from the *Viudicator's* 'Misrepresentation, or gross Inattention.'

He tells me, p. 150, that 'I seem to have Learned Men in Contempt,' but in that I can assure him he thinks amiss, for I am so far from contemning, that I do really respect and honour Learned Men; nevertheless as Men of Learning, are but Men, and as subject to Error as others, it may happen, and has often happen'd, that they may misapply their Talents in defending their own Mistakes, and so dishonour themselves: One Instance whereof is this *Vindicator*, who has forfeited with us the Honour due to his Learning, by his Misapplication of it in the present Controversy.

The *Vindicator*, p. 152, mentions 'Ancient Hereticks' that rejected Water-baptism,' and insinuates, that 'Some of my Arguments were urged by them,' which I think needs no other Reply, than that there were also some Hereticks, very ancient, who mingled the Shadowy and Ceremonious Observations of the Law with the Gospel of Christ: Some of the *Vindicator's* Arguments and Expositions are as probable to have been us'd by the latter as mine by the former.

The *Vindicator*, pag. 153, seems to charge us with 'sighting, laughing at, and ridiculing Water-baptism,' an Imputation on our Part altogether undeserved. We do not sight, or ridicule Water-baptism, but own it to have been a Sign and Ceremony, a Shadow of good Things to come, as all the Legal Rites among the Jews were: We own it to have appertained to the Ministry of John, the Forerunner of Christ, which was a Consummation or Finishing of the diverse Baptisms under the Law; for the Law and the Prophets were until John, Luke xvi. 16. and served to prepare the Way to Christ, Mat. iii. 3. and to make him manifest to Israel, John i. 31.

It

It was figurative of Christ's spiritual Baptism then at hand ; for *John* pointed him out unto the People, *Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the Sin of the World*, *John* i. 29. *I have baptized you with Water, but he shall baptize you with the holy Ghost*, *Mark* i. 8. We do not therefore slight or ridicule Water-baptism, but acknowledge it to have had its Season and Service : It was of a typical and temporary Nature, belonged to *John's* Ministry, served to prepare the Way to Christ ; which Service being over, it is ceased and determined. But although, we our selves are fully satisfied, from the Testimony of the holy Scriptures, and thro' the Goodness and Mercy of God, from some Degree of Experience of the Nature and Spirituality of the Gospel Dispensation, of the Cessation of that typical and shadowy Observation of Water-baptism ; yet do we by no means ridicule the Use of it in any, who being not convinced of the Cessation of that Ceremony, do conscientiously practise it : Nor do we doubt but that the Lord hath Respect to all such as are sincere and upright hearted, though the *Vail* be still so over their Face, that they cannot yet see to the End of that which is abolished, *2 Cor.* iii. 13.

As to *Infant-baptism*, of which *R. Barclay* says, ' 'tis a meer human Tradition, for which there is neither Precept nor Example in all the Scripture,' the *Vindicator* brings not so much as a single Text to prove the contrary ; but produces the Authority of *Calvin*, of whom he says, p. 154, ' All must allow him a great deal more of Learning and Knowledge in Scripture and Antiquity.' The Reason of this Applause of *Calvin* is his appearing on the *Vindicator's* Side ; for when I produced the same Man's Testimony against him, he charges him with being an *Erroneous Interpreter* ; see *Vind.* p. 144. But what says *Calvin*? ' *Nullus est Scriptor tam vetustus, &c.* There is no Writer ever so ancient who does not refer the Baptism of *Infants* to the Age of the Apostles.' And again, ' It were a most miserable *Asylum*, if for the Defence of *Infant-Baptism* we were compelled

' to

‘ to fly to the *bare Authority of the Church.*’ And yet the next Authors whom the *Vindicator* cites, shews they have no other Refuge. ‘ *Origen*, an early Writer and diligent Enquirer into Tradition, says, For this the Church derives a *Tradition from the Apostles*, to give *Baptism to Infants*. And *St. Austin* says, That this the Church received from the Authority or Belief of his Ancestors long before him.’ So that the whole weight of *Infant-baptism* rests upon the Tradition of the Church. Upon which Point let us hear *Dr. Taylor*,

‘ Tradition, *saieth he*, must by all means supply the Place of *Scripture*, and there is pretended a *Tradition Apostolical* that *Infants were baptized*. But at this we are not much moved; for we who rely upon the *written Word* of God, as sufficient to establish all true Religion, do not value the Allegation of *Traditions*. And however the World goes, none of the *Reformed Churches* can pretend this Argument against this Opinion; because they who reject *Tradition* when ’tis against them, must not pretend to it at all for them. But if we should allow the Topick to be good, yet how will it be verified? For so far as it can yet appear, it relies wholly upon the Testimony of *Origen*, for from him *Austin* had it. Now a *Tradition Apostolical*, if it be not consign’d with a fuller Testimony, than of One Person, whom After-ages have condemned of many Errors, will obtain so little Reputation, among those, who know, that Things have upon greater Authority, pretended to derive from the *Apostles*, and yet *falsely*, that it will be a great Argument that he is credulous and weak, that shall be determin’d by so weak Probation in Matters of so great Concernment.’ *Liberty of Prophecyng*, Sect. xviii. No. 25.

A

P O S T S C R I P T.

IN an *Appendix* to my former *Reply*, I made a few Remarks on a *Preface* to a *Reply* to the *Protestant Flail*, then just publish'd; wherein I took Notice with what an *Air* of Contempt the *Prefacer* had treated an *honest Layman* upon his writing a Letter to the *Clergy*.

The *Prefacer* is displeased with me for suggesting, than any *other Layman* on the like Occasion might expect the same Usage from him. As my Suggestion was grounded on his own Practice in a particular Instance; had he retracted his *haughty Treatment* of that Person, I should also readily have retracted that Suggestion: But his Attempting to justify his lofty Demeanour in that Case, is, I think, a Proof of his Readiness to extend it farther on the like Occasion.

I took Notice also of the *Prefacer's* saying, 'that he knew of none that merited or were dignified by that Name (*Protestant Reformers*) but such who had been trained up in Schools and Academies.' Whereupon I produced a few Instances of religious Tradesmen, and holy Women among the early *Protestants* in this Nation, who (with many other such) were sacrificed in the Flames, and seal'd their Testimony against *Popery* with their Blood. I thought, and yet think, that the Christian Courage, immoveable Constancy, and exemplary Patience of those, and such like, was at least as instrumental to the Conversion of others, and carrying on the Work of Reformation, as the Writings, Conferences and Disputes of the more Learned. The *Prefacer* now acknowledges, that 'they were *Martyrs* in
M the

‘ the *Protestant* Cause, and not the the less *eminently*
 ‘ *so*, for wanting the Advantages of human Learning.’
 It has been a proverbial Maxim generally received a-
 mong Christians, that *the Blood of the Martyrs is the*
Seed of the Church ; and one would think that the *Seeds-*
men of the Protestant Church, might merit the Name
 of *Protestant Reformers*. If the *Prefacer* will needs as-
 cribe that *Name* more eminently to those Martyrs, who
 to their constant Suffering added their learned Labours,
 I shall not contend with him about that Point, but he
 ought not to ascribe it to them *alone*, and divest others
 equally faithful of their *proper Title* ; nor indeed ought
 he to ascribe to their Learning only that which is much
 more due to their Suffering. ’Twas in Respect of their
Sufferings, and not of their *Writings*, that *Latimer* said to
Ridley at the Stake, ‘ Be of good Comfort and play
 ‘ the Man, we shall this Day light such a Candle by
 ‘ God’s Grace in *England*, as, I trust, shall never be
 ‘ put out.’ *Fox’s Acls and Mon.* Vol. 3. p. 503. Edit.
 ‘ 1641.

The *Prefacer* admits, that some of the *early Protestant*
Martyrs had not any of this *Literature*, but says ‘ They
 ‘ are supposed to be so instructed by those that had
 ‘ it, as to be able to give a Reason of the Faith and
 ‘ Hope that was in them, and upon Occasion to baffle
 ‘ their *Popish* Examinants.’ And in the Case of *Prest’s*
Wife, declaring ‘ that it was the Spirit of God which led
 ‘ her, which called her in her Bed, and at Midnight opened
 ‘ his Truth to her, he plainly insinuates, that she pre-
 ‘ tended to Revelations that were not such, and which
 ‘ were destitute of all proper Proof, and injured true Re-
 ‘ velation (in causing it to be ridiculed) as much at least
 ‘ as those *Priests* who ridiculed her Pretensions.’ Tho’
 he disclaim the Practice of those *Popish* *Priests* in shouting
 and laughing at her, yet he is one with them, in not
 admitting of such Declarations. But the *Prefacer’s* as-
 cribing their baffling their Examinants to the Instruction
 they received from learned Men, is not very agreeable to
 the Injunction our Saviour gives his Followers when
 brought

brought before Kings and Rulers for his Name's Sake, viz. *Settle it therefore in your Hearts, not to meditate before, what ye shall answer. For I will give you a Mouth and Wisdom, which all your Adversaries shall not be able to gainsay nor resist*, Luke xxi. 14, 15. And his interpreting
 ‘ all private Claims to immediate Inspiration and Revelation from God in these Ages of the World, as the
 ‘ mere Effects of *Enthusiasm*,’ shews, that his Sentiments on those Points are very different from those of the Early *Protestant Reformers*, as may appear, not only from the Testimony of the aforesaid *poor Woman*, and others of small Literature, but from some of the more Learned *Protestant Reformers*.

William Tindal, Martyr, and as *Fox* styles him, an *Apostle of England*, who was burnt at **Filford in Flanders* in the Reign of King *Henry* the 8th, writes thus,
 ‘ When thou art asked, why thou believest that thou
 ‘ shalt be saved by Christ, and of such like Principles of
 ‘ our Faith; answer, *Thou wottest and feelest that it is*
 ‘ *true*: And when he asketh, how thou knowest that it
 ‘ is true? Answer, *Because it is written in thine Heart*:
 ‘ And if he asketh, who wrote it? Answer, *The Spirit*
 ‘ *of God*: And if he asketh, how thou camest first by
 ‘ it? Tell him, Whether by reading in Books, or hearing
 ‘ it preached, as by an outward Instrument, but
 ‘ that *inwardly thou wast taught by the Spirit of God*:
 ‘ And if he asketh, Whether thou believest it not, because
 ‘ it is written in Books, or because the Priests so
 ‘ preach? Answer, *No, not now; but only because it is*
 ‘ *written in thine Heart, and because the Spirit of God so*
 ‘ *preacheth, and so testifieth unto thy Soul*; and say, *Tho’*
 ‘ at the Beginning thou wast moved by Reading or
 ‘ Preaching, as the *Samaritans* were by the Words of
 ‘ the Woman; yet now thou believest it not therefore
 ‘ any longer, but only because thou hast heard it of the
 ‘ *Spirit of God*, and read it *written in thine Heart*.’ *Answer to Sir Thomas More’s Dialogue.*

M 2

Bishop

Bishop Hooper says, ‘ Love the Truth, that God hath opened to us ; it is much requisite that the Members of Christ comfort one another, make Prayers together, confer one with another ; so shall ye be the stronger, and God’s Spirit shall not be absent from you, but in the Midst of you to teach you, to comfort you, to make you wise in all godly Things, patient in Adversity, and strong in Persecution.’ Fox’s *Acts and Monuments*, Vol. 3. p. 158.

At the Eleventh Examination of *John Philpot*, Martyr, before several *Papish* Prelates, *Bonner* ask’d him, ‘ I pray thee in good Sadness, what meanest thou by writing in the Beginning of thy Bible, *Spiritus est Vicarius Christi in terris*, The Spirit is the Vicar of Christ on Earth ? I wis you have some some special Meaning thereof.’ Whereunto *Philpot* answer’d, ‘ I have no other Meaning, than as I have told you already, that Christ, since his Ascension, *worketh all Things in us by his Spirit, and by his Spirit dwelleth in us.*’

The Doctrine of *Immediate Inspiration* and *Revelation* was much insisted on by our Early Reformers ; who knew how to distinguish between the *Shell* and the *Kernel*, the *Bark* and the *Pith*, the *Bone* and the *Marrow* of the *Scriptures*. Outward Learning, according to them, might qualify Men barely to render the Letter of the Scripture out of one Language into another ; but they esteemed the Inspiration and Revelation of the Holy Spirit necessary to understand the true Sense and Meaning thereof. They did not, as the *Prefacer* does, say that ‘ the same Erudition that was requisite for translating the Scriptures into the Vulgar Tongues, will ever be requisite for guarding and defending the true Meaning of them.’ But they referred the Interpretation of them to the Illumination of that Spirit by which they were dictated.

‘ The Scripture, *saieth* William Tindal, hath a Body without, and within a Soul, Spirit and Life ; it hath without a Bark, a Shell, and as it were an hard Bone, for the Fleahly-minded to gnaw upon, and within a
‘ Pith,

‘ Pith, Kernel, Marrow, and all Sweetness for God’s
 ‘ Elect, which he hath chosen to give them his Spirit,
 ‘ and to write his Law, and the Faith of his Son, in their
 ‘ Hearts. See his Prologue upon *Jonas*.

‘ Many are not ashamed to rail and blaspheme, say-
 ‘ ing, How should he understand the *Scripture*, seeing
 ‘ he is no *Philosopher*, never hath seen his *Metaphysick*.
 ‘ Moreover they blaspheme, saying, How can he be a
 ‘ Divine and wotteth not what is *Subiectum in Theologia*.
 ‘ Nevertheless, as a Man without the Spirit of *Aristotle*,
 ‘ or *Philosophy*, may by the Spirit of God understand
 ‘ *Scripture*; even so by the Spirit of God understandeth
 ‘ he, that God is to be sought in all the *Scripture*, and
 ‘ in all Things, and yet wotteth not, what meaneth
 ‘ *Subiectum in Theologia*, because it is a Term of their
 ‘ own making.’ See his Parable of the wicked Mam-
 mon.

Bishop *Juell* saith, ‘ Flesh and Blood is not able to
 ‘ understand the holy Will of God, without special Re-
 ‘ velation. Therefore Christ gave Thanks unto his Fa-
 ‘ ther, for that he had revealed his Secrets unto the little
 ‘ Ones, Mat. xi. and likewise opened the Hearts of his
 ‘ Disciples, that they might understand the *Scriptures*,
 ‘ Luke ii. 4. Without this special Help and Promp-
 ‘ ting of God’s holy Spirit, the Word of God [*Scripture*]
 ‘ is unto the Reader, BE HE NEVER SO WISE, OR
 ‘ WELL LEARNED, as the Vision of a sealed Book.’ *Re-*
ply to Harding’s Answer, p. 534.

‘ As the *Scriptures* were written by the Spirit of God,
 ‘ so must they be expounded by the same. For with-
 ‘ out the Spirit we have neither Ears to hear, nor Eyes
 ‘ to see. It is the Spirit that openeth and no Man shut-
 ‘ teth, The same Spirit prepared and opened the *Silk-*
 ‘ *Woman’s Heart*, that she should give Ear to, and con-
 ‘ sider the Things that were spoken by St. Paul, Acts
 ‘ xvi. and in respect of this Spirit, the Prophet *Isaiab*
 ‘ saith, *Erunt omnes docti a Deo*, They shall be all
 ‘ taught of God, *Isa. liv.*’ *Defence of the Apology*, pag.
 72.

‘ The

‘ The Spirit of God is bound neither to Sharpness of Wit, nor to Abundance of Learning. Often times the Unlearned seeth that the Learned cannot see. Christ saith, *I thank thee, O Father, the Lord of Heaven and Earth, for that thou hast hidden these Things from the wise and politicke, and hast revealed the same unto the little Ones,* Mat. iv.’ *Ibid.* p. 532.

‘ *Our Learning is the Cross of Christ; of other Learning we make no Vaunts.* God is called the God of Truth, and not of Learning. St. Paul saith, *All kind of Learning shall be abolished, and consumed to nothing,* 1 Cor. xiii. God make us all learned to the Kingdom of Heaven, Mat. xiii.’ *Ibid.* p. 623.

Archbishop Sandys, in a Sermon preached before Queen Elizabeth on Psal. lxxxvi. 11, *Teach me thy Way, O Lord, I will walk in thy Truth,* says, ‘ As he, the Psalmist, desireth to be taught, so it is especially to be noted, that his Desire is to be taught of God, teach thou me, O Lord; there is none can open the sealed Book of God, but only the Lion of the Tribe of Juda, the Root of David, the Lamb of God. For, Thou art worthy to take the Book, and to open the seven Seals thereof, because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy Blood, Rev. v. It is he that hath the Key of David, which openeth, and no Man shutteth; shutteth, and no Man openeth. For the outward Reading of the Word, without the inward working of his Spirit is nothing. The precise Pharisees, the learned Scribes, read the Scriptures over and over again; they not only read them in Books, but wore them on their Garments; they were not only taught, but were able themselves to teach others. But because this heavenly Teacher had not instructed them, they were ignorant altogether in that saving Truth which the Prophet David is so desirous to learn.—There is but one Teacher in the School of Christ, he it is that leadeth into all Truth.’ See his Sermons, printed in 1616, p. 48, b. and 49. a.

Many like Testimonies might be brought ; but let these suffice to shew that the Doctrine of the Necessity of immediate *Inspiration* and *Revelation*, as held by the *Quakers*, was the Doctrine of our Early Reformers from *Popery* ; however now a-days opposed by many *Teachers* among *Protestants*.

We come next to *George Fox's Declaration* or *Protestation* against *Popery* ; which I produced to shew, that the *Quakers* ' were a Set of *Reformers* more zealous for ' the Extirpation of *Popery*, not only in some, but in ' all the Branches of it, yea, the very *Root* it self, than ' any that went before them.' This *Declaration* the *Prefacer* is pleased to call ' a sacrilegious Attempt to ' abolish *Sacraments*, *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, *Orders* of ' *Ministers*, and every outward Institution of Religion ' whatsoever.' But as he has not entred into any Particulars of that *Declaration*, those hard Words prove nothing : Let him if he can, support by Scripture Testimony the Things there protested against : But that, I suppose, he sees impracticable, and therefore does not attempt it. I am still of Opinion, that if all the Things denied and testified against in that *Declaration* were removed and taken out of the Way, yet every outward Institution of Religion whatsoever, taught or established by Christ and his Apostles, might nevertheless remain entire, whole, and undefaced. I really think, the *Prefacer* has better Reasons, than any he has yet given, for declaring, that he ' shall have no farther Concern with ' *George Fox* or his *Declaration*.'

What I meant by *Retarding the Progress of the Reformation*, I think I expressed plainly enough before ; my Meaning was, That the *Reformation* from *Popery* in *England*, begun in the 15th Century, then extended but to a partial, not a total Extirpation of *Popery* ; that Men of *Academical Literature*, consulting their own Honour and Interest, still continued to adorn themselves with *her Robes*, and to retain many of her *Relicks*. That in the 16th Century *George Fox* and others were zealously concern'd to carry on the *Reformation* before begun, by
testifying

testifying against the remaining Relicks of *Popery*. Which Testimony of theirs, still progressive in the same Work of *Reformation*, was opposed by Men of *Academical Literature*, with a Violence and Fury not much inferior to the *Marian* Persecution. Wherefore I thought it unequal to ascribe the whole Merit of the *Reformation* in this Nation to that Kind of Men, who in the former Century *impeded* the Work then begun, of rooting out *Popery* and *Superstition*, and in the latter violently opposed the Progress of it.

As to the *Quotations* from Bishop *Taylor*, of which I said, that 'if the Bishop had been always firm and steady in his Opinion on the Side of *Infant-baptism*, 'tis no small Discredit to that Cause, that his great Abilities could never put his own Sentiments into as advantagious a Light as those of his Adversaries.' Let the Reader peruse those *Quotations*, and then judge whether the *Prefacer* does Justice to the Bishop's Arguments, in calling them 'Flights of his Fancy, and the Strength of his Imagination.'

But he is offended at my saying that '*Academical Learning* is an Instrument more apt to defend *Error*, than to discover *Truth*.' Though himself acknowledges, that 'it can defend *Error* even to make it seem cogent and convincing.' A deceitful Quality, unapt for *Truth*'s Service, which needs no such *Legerdemain*. This *Academical Learning* which can defend *Error*, by putting on it a feigned Shew of *Truth*, has been also accustomed to *disguise* *Truth* under a false Vizard of *Error*: In both which Parts of *Academical Subtilty*, some Persons endowed with it, have exerted themselves against the *Quakers*, whose *Doctrine* nevertheless remains firm and unshaken, under the Protection of the *holy Scriptures*, and the *Spirit* by which they were dictated.

15 JY 64

F I N I S.